



RATAN TATA LIBRARY
DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY SYSTEM

D.U.P. No. 934-10.83- 5,000

RATAN TATA LIBRARY (DULS)

(Delhi School of Economics)

TEXT BOOK

Cl. No. 476:3 (X).73-N4 H3

Ac. No. 37101

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of 25 paise per day will be charged for the first two days and 50 Paise from the third day the book is kept overtime.

[illegible]

THE NEGRO'S SHARE



THE NEGRO'S SHARE

A Study of
Income, Consumption, Housing
and Public Assistance

RICHARD STERNER

in collaboration with
LENORE A. EPSTEIN
ELLEN WINSTON
and Others



HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS
New York London

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

*Copyright, 1943, by Harper & Brothers
Printed in the United States of America*

All rights in this book are reserved.

*No part of the book may be reproduced in any
manner whatsoever without written permission
except in the case of brief quotations embodied
in critical articles and reviews. For information
address Harper & Brothers*

D-S



This book is complete and unabridged
in contents, and is manufactured in strict
conformity with Government regulations
for saving paper.

This study was made possible by funds
granted by Carnegie Corporation of New
York. That Corporation is not, however,
the author, owner, publisher, or proprietor
of this publication, and is not to be under-
stood as approving by virtue of its grant any
of the statements made or views expressed
therein.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	ix
---------------	----

FOREWORD	xi
----------------	----

PART I. LIVING CONDITIONS

I. THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY	3
What Should Be the Negro's Share?	5
II. OCCUPATIONAL AND EMPLOYMENT TRENDS: THE NEGRO'S FLIGHT FROM AGRICULTURE	10
Causes of the Negro's Movement from the Farm ..	12
Negro Gains in Nonagricultural Pursuits	21
III. OCCUPATIONAL AND EMPLOYMENT TRENDS: EMPLOY- MENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT	29
The Labor Force	29
The Nonworkers	35
The Unemployed	39
The Employed	45
IV. FAMILY COMPOSITION	47
Family Size	48
Lodgers	54
Workers in Negro and Native White Families	55
V. FAMILY INCOMES	59
General Sources of Data on Family Incomes.....	59
Income, by Type of Community	60
Farm Families	62
Southern Village Families	70
Urban Families	71
Sources of Family Income	73
Farm Families	74
Nonfarm Families	77

The Relation of Family Size and Age Composition to Family Income	80
Evaluation of the Incomes of Negro and White Families in Terms of Minimum Standard Budgets..	83
VI. FAMILY EXPENDITURES	89
The Balance of Income and Expenditures	91
Distribution of Expenditures by Major Categories of Consumption	94
VII. FOOD CONSUMPTION	102
Expenditures for Various Foodstuffs	105
Quantities of Various Foodstuffs Consumed	110
Proportions of Families That Consume Various Foods	114
Nutritive Content of Diets	117
VIII. FAMILY EXPENDITURES FOR GOODS AND SERVICES	
OTHER THAN FOOD AND HOUSING	130
Household Operation and Furnishings	130
Clothing	137
Personal Care	141
Travel and Transportation	144
Medical Care	149
Recreation and Leisure-time Activities	154
Formal Education	159
Gifts, Contributions, and Personal Taxes	161
IX. HOUSING CONDITIONS: RURAL HOUSING	166
Rural-farm Housing	166
Structural Aspects of Rural-farm Housing	167
Facilities and Conveniences	172
Crowded Living Conditions	176
Rural-nonfarm Housing	181
X. HOUSING CONDITIONS: URBAN HOUSING	185
Quality of Housing	186
Overcrowding	192
Home Ownership	195
Rentals	196
Segregation in Negro Urban Housing	200
Patterns of Segregation	202
Methods of Enforcing Segregation	206
Factors Limiting Segregation	209

PART II. SOCIAL WELFARE

XI. INTRODUCTION	213
XII. THE NEGRO ON RELIEF DURING THE EARLIER PERIOD OF THE NEW DEAL	218
General Incidence of Relief	219
Composition of Families on Relief	230
Size of Relief Grants, by Type of Relief	233
XIII. WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION	239
Proportion of Negroes on WPA	239
Wage Rates and Occupational Classification on WPA	246
Type of Project	251
XIV. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FOR YOUTH	254
The Civilian Conservation Corps	254
The National Youth Administration	261
Student Work Program	262
Out-of-school Work Program	266
Conclusion	269
XV. CATEGORICAL ASSISTANCE	271
Old-age Assistance	272
Aid to the Blind	277
Aid to Dependent Children	280
XVI. GENERAL RELIEF AFTER 1935	286
Federal Assistance in Kind	290
XVII. FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	295
Standard Loan Program	298
Grant Program	304
Tenant-purchase Program	305
Rehabilitation Project Program	307
XVIII. HOUSING POLICIES	310
Activities of Housing Agencies	312
Subsidized Housing	316
APPENDIX A. SURVEYS OF FAMILY INCOMES AND EXPENDI- TURES	327

APPENDIX B. CONSUMER PURCHASES STUDY EXPENDITURE	
SAMPLE	330
APPENDIX C. LISTS OF TABLES	338
Text Tables	338
Appendix Tables	346
APPENDIX D. APPENDIX TABLES	351
INDEX	425

PREFACE

This monograph is one in a series of special investigations concerning the American Negro which was instituted and financed by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The entire Carnegie study of the Negro in America was planned by Dr. Gunnar Myrdal of the University of Stockholm and was directed first by him and later by Dr. Samuel A. Stouffer of the University of Chicago.

Early in 1939 general responsibility for the investigation of the Negro's living conditions and of his participation in social-welfare programs was assigned to me. Although I alone am responsible for the final content of this report, the assistance of Miss Lenore A. Epstein in preparing the original materials on income and consumption, of Mr. Milton Woll in analyzing housing conditions, of Dr. Berta Asch and Mr. Arnold Rose in preparing preliminary drafts on the public-welfare programs, and of Mrs. Mary C. Ingham in handling most of the basic computations is gratefully acknowledged. Dr. Ellen Winston has shared the responsibility of revising and supplementing the original materials and has prepared the manuscript for publication.

A number of experts have reviewed various sections of the monograph. For critical review of portions of the manuscript I am indebted to Dr. Dorothy S. Brady, Dr. Evelyn Burns, Dr. John Char-now, Miss Anne Geddes, Dr. A. J. Jaffe, Dr. James G. Maddox, Dr. Day Monroe, Dr. Hazel K. Stiebeling, Dr. Paul Webbink, Dr. Louis Wirth, and Dr. Faith Williams.

It is impossible to enumerate all persons, white and Negro, in official federal and local agencies or privately occupied who have given generous assistance with regard to various sources of information, who have made available unpublished materials, or who have provided direct information on actual conditions.

I owe a particular obligation to Dr. Gunnar Myrdal for his suggestions concerning some of the fundamental interrelationships between family structure, level of living, and social-welfare policies and for his continued encouragement throughout the progress of the study. Dr. Samuel A. Stouffer, both during the time that he served as

Acting Director of the Carnegie Negro study and later as Executive Secretary of the committee for supervising publication of materials from the study, has rendered valuable advice and has, on several occasions, helped me make arrangements essential to the completion of the work.

I feel inclined to agree with a criticism made by a scholar familiar with this whole field who was kind enough to look over the final draft of the manuscript. With special reference to the chapters on social-welfare policies, he characterized the treatment "of conditions in this area of Negro interest" as a "conservative statement" and even as an "understatement." The reason for this, however, is not that I have wanted to lean over backwards by minimizing discriminations against the Negro but rather the difficulty, in many instances, of finding watertight evidence on differential practices. This is partly due to the insufficiency of continuous reporting, by many public-assistance agencies, of statistical data on the share of the benefits Negroes are receiving. While I do not think that I have exhausted all available statistical materials, I believe that the main supplementation should come from field work which should be more extensive than could be considered in a study of this over-all type.

RICHARD STERNER

Princeton, New Jersey
January, 1942

FOREWORD

The Negro's Share, a Study of Income, Consumption, Housing, and Public Assistance, by Richard Sterner, is one of several monographs, resulting from a study of the Negro in America, made under the leadership of Dr. Gunnar Myrdal and under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. This study was announced in the annual report of the Carnegie Corporation for 1938 in the following words:

"The Corporation has for some time felt the need of a general study of the Negro in the United States, not only as a guide to its own activities, but for broader reasons. It appeared to be essential that such a study be made under the direction of a person who would be free from the presuppositions and emotional charges which we all share to a greater or less degree on this subject, and the Corporation, therefore, looked outside the United States for a distinguished student of the social sciences who would be available to organize and direct the project. It is a pleasure to announce that Dr. Karl Gunnar Myrdal has been granted a leave of absence from the University of Stockholm to enable him to accept the invitation of the Trustees to undertake this work."

To assist in this undertaking, Dr. Myrdal requested some twenty students of the American Negro to prepare memoranda on all the more important aspects of Negro life in the United States, and on numerous minor ones. In general, these memoranda were not designed for publication in the form written. The instructions were to prepare working memoranda rapidly and in a full and easy style which would make them most useful for the purposes of the director. Thus by definition they were not to be formal, balanced manuscripts ready for the printer and the public.

Before the close of the investigation, Dr. Myrdal was obliged to return to Sweden for a stay of several months. During his absence Dr. Samuel A. Stouffer of the University of Chicago served as executive officer, and the undersigned committee was appointed to advise regarding possible publication of the memoranda prepared for the director and to offer aid in the publication of those manu-

scripts that were complete and deemed suitable for making into books.

The Committee found that every memorandum submitted offered significant contributions, but that not all were near enough to meeting the requirements of a book to justify publication. However, it was possible to arrange for the publication of several of them, among which was this monograph by Dr. Sterner and his collaborators, Miss Lenore A. Epstein and Dr. Ellen Winston.

Dr. Sterner is new to American readers. He came with Dr. Myrdal to the United States from Sweden, where he had had a dozen years of distinguished research experience. During this time he worked in various capacities with the government in making reports, statistical analyses, and investigations of social conditions in Sweden. Indeed he is outstanding in Sweden as a scientist in the service of the government investigating social questions. His many publications deal with housing, standards of living, nutrition, working conditions, and population. He comes, then, without previous bias to this study of an important aspect of the problem of the Negro in the United States.

From Dr. Sterner and his collaborators we learn what the Negro gets from his work and from his economic environment of the good things America has to offer as seen in his housing, standard of living, and social benefits of one kind or another. We are thus enabled to compare the Negro's share with that of the whites in these goods and services, and also to see what they mean for the happiness and welfare of his race.

SHELBY M. HARRISON
WILLIAM F. OGBURN
DONALD YOUNG, *Chairman*

PART I

LIVING CONDITIONS



Chapter I

THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The problem of the Negro's economic position in American society has two major aspects. One concerns the conditions under which the Negro participates in economic life as a factor in production—in other words how he earns his bread as a farmer, laborer, domestic, teacher, and so forth. The other aspect, and the one which is the main emphasis of this study, refers to what he gets out of the economic system as an income-receiver and consumer; namely, his level of living. True, there is no strict border line between the two problems; they tend to overlap. Any study of working conditions should ordinarily contain data on the remuneration received for the work, and an investigation of living conditions may include some reference to the sources of income and the general economic and occupational status of the population groups considered. Yet the emphases are quite different. A labor-market analyst stresses individual earnings per hour, per week, or per year, while a student of living conditions stresses the family income and tries to discover how far that income goes. He must take into account the size and composition of the families and their effect in bringing about variations in living conditions. He must also consider the effect of differences in ability to plan the family economy. Hence it is necessary to ask such questions as the following: To what extent are the individual incomes of the family pooled or spent by the individual members on things which possibly are of doubtful necessity? To what extent are primary needs of the families and individuals generally taken care of before minor needs? Do the families, within the limits of their resources, make every attempt to balance their budgets? Is the best kind of food purchased for the amount available for this purpose? These problems and many others should be seen against the background of family organization in general.

In considering the Negro in America it is pertinent not only to analyze the level of living of the Negro but also to investigate the

differences between Negroes and whites. This leads to a consideration of such related questions as whether Negroes have better or poorer facilities than whites; e.g., whether they have to pay more for the same kind of houses than white consumers, whether it is easier to find cut-rate stores with their good values in Negro urban neighborhoods than in white sections; whether rural Negroes more often than rural whites are forced to buy from plantation or company stores which charge high prices or exorbitant interest rates. And last, but not least, the position of Negroes in the public economy and in the public and private relief system has to be taken into account: whether they have available public facilities (schools, hospitals, parks, health centers, playgrounds, bathing beaches, etc.) comparable to those of whites; whether they obtain public or private relief more often than whites and, if this is the case, whether in individual cases they must be in greater need of relief in order to get it, and whether they receive the same amount of relief as white persons in corresponding circumstances. Such topics also lead to the question of whether the total of direct and indirect taxation is higher or lower in proportion to Negroes' incomes than it is for white citizens and whether Negroes pay more or less in direct and indirect taxation than they receive in the form of public facilities and public relief; that is, whether the public economy represents a net benefit that they are getting from the white population or whether it is the other way around.¹

¹ This problem is relevant not only because of the growing relative importance of the public economy but also because of the fact that certain popular notions on the subject are used as main arguments for restricting public services to Negroes. (See, for instance, Hortense Powdermaker, *After Freedom*, The Viking Press, New York, 1939, p. 130.) It is obvious that whites, even in relation to their incomes, pay a much larger share than Negroes of direct taxes, property taxes, and automobile taxes. It must be considered, however, that property taxes in part are passed over to the tenants and that other indirect taxes, most of which tend to be regressive, have to be added. On the other side of the balance sheet it may be noted that Negroes, although not in all cases, receive a proportionally larger share than whites of relief payments. (See Part II.) In proportion to their numbers, they probably receive less than whites, however, of the direct and indirect benefits of the AAA system. (See Appendix table 6 regarding displacement of tenants during the thirties, and Table 30 regarding AAA payments.) In many instances (schools, public recreational facilities, motoring on highways) they get less out of the public economy in their capacity as consumers, and their representation on the public pay rolls is always smaller than in the general population. The problem of whether the balance between such payments and benefits by and large is more favorable for Negroes than for whites appears more unsettled than one at first sight would believe. A case when Negroes actually seemed to receive less than they paid for from the public economy has been analyzed by Woofter and associates (T. J. Woofter, Jr., *Black Yeomanry*, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1930, pp. 158-185). The community that was studied, however, as Woofter readily admits (p. vi), was certainly exceptional in many respects. A more representative study would be highly significant.

This study is not intended to be exhaustive. Some of the problems indicated will be analyzed in detail. In the case of other problems the evidence presented will not be conclusive. Still other problems will be scarcely considered either because of inadequate data or because of limitations of time and space.

WHAT SHOULD BE THE NEGRO'S SHARE?

When is the level of living low and when is it high? The answer depends on the standard adopted. The basis of comparison can be selected in many different ways. This is one of the reasons why there is often such a difference of opinion with regard to evaluations of the actual living conditions of a particular population. The problem may seem to have little significance for a study of the Negro's level of living, which will appear low regardless of the point of view. On the other hand, there is probably even more variation in the ideologies regarding living conditions in the case of the Negro than there is with regard to whites so that the question of the basis of comparison even in this case is really more important than would at first appear.

There are several points of reference which seem relevant when evaluating the Negro's living conditions. One is the living conditions of the white group. One standard of equality is that Negroes should share in economic opportunities and benefits in proportion to their numbers in the population. This would imply that the average level of living for the Negro population should correspond to that of the white population. There may also be ideologies, however, which do not have this implication but which nevertheless could be called equalitarian. One may accept the consequences of the fact that the average adult Negro, because of poorer educational opportunities and other environmental circumstances, is unable to compete for the more remunerative jobs in much the same way that one recognizes economic differences within the white group which likewise are due to different educational opportunities. Such an attitude can be coupled with a demand for equal economic chances for Negroes and whites who have the same abilities and qualities as workers, citizens, and consumers. Even those who believe that the Negro's lower average level of living is due not only to environmental factors but to some extent also to innate racial inferiority² may accept a similar principle, but only if they admit variations in ability among Negroes and that

² No scientific evidence on any innate intellectual inferiority of the Negro race has ever been presented. An up-to-date review of the discussions on this topic is given in a recent monograph in this series (Otto Klineberg, editor, *Characteristics of the American Negro*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943).

many Negroes are as capable as many whites does this acceptance have any practical significance.

There is no denying the fact, however, that there are many who firmly believe that the Negro should not have the same economic opportunities as whites. They cite various reasons for this attitude: that Negroes not only in the average case but virtually in all individual cases have a racial quality which is inferior to that of all whites or most whites; that Negroes would not work unless forced to do so by sheer poverty;³ or simply that this is a white man's country and that the best economic opportunities, therefore, should be reserved for the white people.⁴ The following quotation suggests the prevalence of this point of view:

An additional argument in favor of salary differentials is the general tradition of the South that Negroes and whites are not to be paid equivalent salaries for equivalent work. The attitude may be considered wrong from whatever angle it is viewed, but the fact remains that the custom is one that is almost universal and one that the practical school administrator dare not ignore. Until such time as Negroes are permitted and encouraged to maintain a standard of living equivalent to that maintained by the white race, it would seem that part of the wisdom in the South [is] to provide different salary schedules for white and Negro teachers.⁵

The main emphasis in the same report, however, is put on an argument which at first sight appears to be of a somewhat different type; namely, an alleged difference in cost of living of Negroes and whites:

When this problem is given consideration, observation alone would suggest to the unbiased observer that the Negro teacher will be able to purchase within her society a relatively higher standard of living than the white teacher will be able to secure with the same amount of money.

³ Hortense Powdermaker, *op. cit.*, p. 118. The same argument has been used for centuries, particularly by mercantilistic writers, in regard to the European laboring class (Eli Filip Heckscher, *Mercantilism*, Macmillan and Company, Ltd., London, 1935).

⁴ See Hortense Powdermaker, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

⁵ "A Salary Study for the Lexington Public Schools," *Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service*, College of Education, University of Kentucky, Vol. 7, Number 3, March, 1935. This study was made at the request of Superintendent H. H. Hill. It should be noted that the practice of paying different salaries to Negro and white teachers of equal competence and with equal work was declared unconstitutional in 1940 (Decision by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals of June 18, 1940, in the case of *Melvin Alston v. the School Board of Norfolk, Virginia*). In spite of this decision, however, only a few communities have abolished the salary differentials. Some have offered plans for their gradual elimination over a period of years. In a number of other communities new court cases are under deliberation. This gives some indication of the vigor of the nonequalitarian creed.

Put in a different way, it would seem that the Negro teacher could achieve, with less income, a standard of living among the members of her race equivalent to a standard maintained by a white teacher in a white society.

The small amount of statistical evidence available with respect to living cost for white and Negro teachers would seem to lend support to the above view. . . . The median cost of room and board reported by twenty-nine white teachers who actually were making a cash outlay for these purposes was \$537. For seven Negro teachers reporting, the median cost of room and board for twelve months was \$376, or about 70 per cent of the cost for white teachers. Obviously, the number of cases involved here is too small to insure any high degree of reliability. However, data assembled by Cooke for 2767 teachers representing thirty-two different school units show approximately the same relationship. This investigation shows that . . . the average salary for the entire group of Negro teachers was 57 per cent of the average salary for the entire group of white teachers, and that the average cost of living for Negro teachers is 76 per cent of that for white teachers. . . .⁶

A difference in cost of living, however, always means that a certain level of living, defined in terms of a given quantity of goods and services of given quality, can be had for a smaller minimum amount of money in one case than in another. In the study quoted no attempt was made to prove that the lower living expenses of the Negro teachers were not simply to be explained by the fact that they had lower salaries and, therefore, had to content themselves with more modest living quarters and meals of poorer quality than whites enjoyed. There is nothing which indicates that this is anything but one of the common vicious-circle arguments which are based on the formula that "Negroes need less because they have a lower standard of living." Behind this statement there may be certain factual claims—for instance, that Negroes are less able than whites to handle money wisely⁷—but the main content seems to be that since Negroes are accustomed to have less, they should continue to be kept in this inferior position.⁸

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ This interpretation was given to the writer by a social worker in a responsible position in a large southern city (Interview, January, 1940). Some factual material on the problem is presented in Chapters VI and VII below.

⁸ This particular motivation for the nonequalitarian philosophy has been discussed because it seems to be quite prevalent and, further, because it appears with false factual and sometimes even pseudoscientific pretensions. The nonequalitarian ideology per se, on the other hand, cannot be criticized on scientific grounds. It is a basic value premise just as is the equalitarian creed, and the choice between the two is a personal matter entirely. For this reason, it should be stated frankly that

Even a principle of racial equality in regard to economic opportunities, however, does not of itself imply that there should be no poor Negroes but only that the chances of becoming rich and the risks of becoming poor should be the same for Negroes as for whites—either in general or within each social and occupational group. There is another set of ideals which approaches the problem from a different angle. It puts the emphasis on the incidence of extreme poverty. According to this approach the level of living should not fall below a certain minimum standard and if it does so, in some cases, it is evaluated mainly by the proportion of the population that is below the minimum level and by how far under the level this part of the population is. Average figures for the entire population or for occupational or social groups are stressed only when they are below or close to the minimum. The living conditions for that part of the population which is above the minimum standard are not considered of primary interest. They may be given some consideration, however, when special allowances are made for a certain margin of safety in the minimum standard itself; or because a point is made of the “unjust” income distribution and of the theoretical possibilities of abolishing poverty by leveling off this distribution; or, finally, because of the widespread belief in the necessity of granting high incomes to business leaders if the economic machinery is to be kept functioning. All such considerations, however, are of secondary import to the proponents of a minimum standard of living.

A minimum standard of living can be defined in many different ways. By and large the requirements have been raised during the last few decades. This may be a reflection to some extent of the general improvement in the level of living. It is only natural that the concepts of what should be the minimum will follow the changes in actual conditions. The main reason, however, is that through scientific advances it has been ascertained that a level of living which formerly was considered good enough to keep a person alive and in reasonably good working condition actually may cause serious health hazards. The new emphasis on the vitamin and mineral content of diets in particular has substantially raised the concepts of the mini-

whenever in this book it has been necessary to make such a choice, it is the equalitarian philosophy which has been used as the basic principle. An *explicit* statement of this kind does not make a discussion any less objective, for the alternative is to *conceal* the value premises on which the discussion is based. (Regarding this methodological problem, see Gunnar Myrdal, *Das Politische Element in der Nationalökonomischen Doktrininbildung*, Berlin, 1932, *passim*; Alva Myrdal, *Nation and Family*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1941, pp. 100-103; and the forthcoming volume on the Negro problem by Gunnar Myrdal.)

imum level of living.⁹ Also in other fields, such as housing and medical care, the requirements are being raised, but so far they have not been defined with the same relative exactness as in the case of nutrition. Although there is still a certain arbitrariness about the whole concept of a minimum standard of living, it nevertheless has so much of an objective content that it constitutes a highly valuable instrument for an appraisal of actual living conditions. Therefore, an attempt to evaluate the Negro's level of living on such a basis will be made in subsequent chapters.

The increased minimum requirements may seem to have made the problem of attaining adequate living conditions a more difficult one than formerly. Such a consequence has been neutralized, however, by the improvements in production techniques. It should furthermore be noted that the increased emphasis on health has provided a more positive approach to the whole standard-of-living concept. It puts a new and strong emphasis on the preventive aspects of all social-welfare work, giving added strength to the argument that such policies are not necessarily a mere burden on the national economy that can be motivated only on the basis of humanitarian, equalitarian, and "insurance-against-revolution" principles. Rather they can be directed in such a way that they will represent a highly profitable investment. That this is particularly true in the case of the Negro will be amply verified in the following pages.

⁹ See, for example, *Final Report of the Mixed Committee of the League of Nations on the Relation of Nutrition to Health, Agriculture and Economic Policy*, Geneva, 1937.

Chapter II

OCCUPATIONAL AND EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

The Negro's Flight from Agriculture

Among the many factors which influence the living conditions of the Negro, there is scarcely any other of such dynamic significance as his movement out of southern agriculture into southern and northern cities. After 1910 the Negro migration from southern farm areas became intensive. Prior to that year it had been much smaller than the excess of births over deaths in Negro farm families, so that there was a rapid increase in the Negro farm population. The number of male Negro workers in agriculture increased by over half a million or by about 40 per cent from 1890 to 1910 (Appendix table 1).¹ Manufacturing and mechanical industries, trade and transportation, provided for another half million new jobs for Negro males during the same twenty-year period. The relative rate of increase was much higher, about 170 per cent for manufacturing and mechanical industries and 125 per cent for trade and transportation. Yet in 1910, 58 per cent of all Negro male workers were still engaged in agriculture and the proportion had been only slightly higher in 1890.

From 1910 to 1920, on the other hand, the number of Negro male workers in agriculture decreased from 1,780,000 to 1,520,000

¹The number of male workers in agriculture constitutes a much better index than the number of workers of both sexes. The number of Negro female workers in agriculture showed a peak in 1910 which was out of all proportion to real conditions. It was 582,000 in 1900, 1,051,000 in 1910, and 612,000 in 1920 (U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Negroes in the United States, 1790-1915*, pp. 509 and 510; and *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930*, Population Vol. V, pp. 74-75). These fluctuations were largely due to a change in the definition of gainful worker which applied to females in farm homes. Also in the case of males there was such an increase between 1890 and 1910 in the proportion of gainful workers that the statistics may give a somewhat exaggerated picture of the occupational changes. (See *Thirteenth Census of the United States: 1910*, Population Vol. IV, p. 16.)

or by 15 per cent. There was some slight tendency toward a decline also during the twenties, resulting in a level of about 1,490,000 by 1930 (Appendix table 2). The overwhelming majority or 97 per cent of these Negro workers were in the South. The total number of male workers in southern agriculture was also decreasing between 1910 (5,304,000) and 1920 (4,750,000) but showed a small increase during the twenties to 4,810,000 by 1930. This means that between 1910 and 1930 even the absolute number of male agricultural workers in the South declined more for Negroes (by almost 300,000) than for whites (by about 200,000), and the relative decrease was between two and three times greater for Negroes (16 per cent) than for whites (6 per cent).

That Negroes are leaving southern agriculture much more rapidly than whites is confirmed by the data on farm population in the census reports of 1920, 1930, and 1940 (Table 1). The Negro rural-farm

Table 1. Changes in the Rural-farm Population in Southern States, by Color, 1920-1940

State	Colored as per cent of total population, 1940		Per cent increase or decrease (-) in rural-farm population			
			1930-1940		1920-1930	
	All Residence groups	Rural-farm	Colored	White	Negro	White
The South ^{a/}	24.0*	27.4	- 4.5	2.1	- 8.6	- 3.0
Virginia	24.8	25.6	- 9.0	- 0.3	-15.9	- 8.3
North Carolina	28.2	30.3	- 2.4	6.1	6.5	6.1
South Carolina	43.0	53.9	- 1.3	1.4	-22.1	- 4.0
Georgia	34.7	37.2	- 8.6	*	-26.4	- 7.3
Florida	27.0	26.6	6.9	11.8	-13.9	4.0
Tennessee	17.3	12.6	- 8.5	7.1	-14.0	- 2.6
Alabama	34.8	35.8	- 3.4	2.3	- 3.6	2.5
Mississippi	49.5	55.7	2.2	4.2	5.7	9.0
Arkansas	24.8	26.7	- 8.6	2.8	- 2.7	- 2.3
Louisiana	36.0	44.8	2.3	3.9	3.1	6.7
Oklahoma	9.9	10.7	-26.5	- 6.0	1.9	- 1.7
Texas	14.5	16.6	-13.0	- 6.9	- 1.3	- 8.4

* Less than 0.05 per cent.

^{a/} Includes the following states in addition to those shown in the table: Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, West Virginia, and Kentucky.

Sources: Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. II, pp. 62-64; and Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-5, No. 8, and P-5a, Nos. 14, 15, and 16.

population of the South declined by 8.6 per cent between 1920 and 1930, whereas the decrease for the white farm population was 4.6 per cent for the country as a whole and 3.0 per cent for the South. The preliminary returns from the 1940 census show that the exodus

of colored people from southern farm areas continued during the thirties in spite of the industrial depression. While the rate of decrease in the colored farm population of the South between 1930 and 1940 (4.5 per cent) was little more than half that during the twenties, the development continued to be different from that for the southern white farm population, which showed a small increase (2.1 per cent) during the thirties.

As a result of these changes the proportion of Negroes working in agriculture or living on farms has become a minority among the Negro people. Already by 1930 the proportion of all Negro male workers obtaining their livelihood from agriculture had declined to 41 per cent and the proportion of Negroes residing on farms to 39 per cent. Of the southern Negroes almost half (49 per cent) were living on farms in 1930, but the proportion of the southern colored population on farms in 1940 was somewhat smaller (45 per cent). The corresponding figure for the southern white population (37 per cent) was still lower, but the Negro-white differential was not so extremely large any more.

CAUSES OF THE NEGRO'S MOVEMENT FROM THE FARM

There are several reasons why Negro agricultural workers have been leaving southern agriculture with greater rapidity than white farm workers. Some of them have to do with conditions outside southern farm areas. Others are intimately connected with the agricultural problems of the South, such as the boll weevil, soil erosion, widespread tenancy, the one- or two-crop gamble, the movement of cotton production to the Southwest and West, the general overproduction, the AAA reductions in cash-crop acreage, and increasing mechanization. It is probable that most of these factors have affected Negroes more than whites.

The effect of any force which tends to drive an agricultural population off the land is dependent in part upon how strongly this population is attached to the soil. Of all Negro workers in southern agriculture in 1930 only 177,000 or less than one-tenth were owners, part owners, or managers (Table 2). In comparison 1,474,000 or about three-fourths were sharecroppers, wage workers, or unpaid family workers, and 302,000 were cash or share tenants. Even among white farm workers in the South the proportion of owners the Negro owners seven to one. The white cash and share tenants was as low as one-third as against around 45 per cent in the North and West; yet the southern white farm owners outnumbered

Table 2. - Workers in Agriculture, by Tenure Status, 1930 (in thousands)

Tenure status	United States		The South		The North and West	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
All gainful workers in agriculture <u>a/</u>	1,988	8,192	1,945	3,502	43	4,690
Total <u>b/</u>	1,995	8,435	1,954	3,618	42	4,817
Owners and managers <u>c/</u>	182	3,418	177	1,250	5	2,168
All tenants <u>c/</u>	701	1,954	694	1,092	7	862
Croppers	-	-	392	383	-	-
Other tenants	-	-	302	709	-	-
Wage workers <u>a/</u>	539	2,008	511	599	28	1,409
Unpaid family workers <u>a/</u>	573	1,005	571	677	2	378

a/ Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, Population Vol. IV, State table 11.

b/ Total of categories in table.

c/ Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, Agriculture Vol. II, County table I.
A few colored other than Negroes are included.

constituted about one-fifth of all white agricultural workers in the South and were more than twice as numerous as the corresponding Negro group. Almost one-half of the white workers were croppers, wage workers, and unpaid family laborers. These groups of white workers together were not much larger numerically, however, than the same groups in the Negro farm population.

Data on the number of years spent on the present farm (Appendix table 3) corroborate the contention that there is a positive relationship between stability and tenure status. More than one-third of the colored and almost one-half of the white croppers in 1935 had been on their farms less than one year. The same figures for full owners were 5 and 7 per cent, respectively. Movements as frequent as those indicated in the case of croppers and other tenants have an adverse effect on living conditions. It is interesting to find, however, that in each tenure group Negroes tend to stay on their farms somewhat longer than whites; but in spite of this Negroes, by and large, are more mobile than whites for the simple reason that they are more heavily concentrated in the lower tenure groups. This difference would no doubt appear even more pronounced if the figures had referred to all agricultural workers, including wage laborers.

Not only are Negroes more heavily concentrated than whites in groups which presumably are less firmly attached to the land; they also tend to have a more precarious economic status within each group. The owner-operated farms have a larger acreage and a higher value per farm than the sharecropper farms, while those operated by cash and share tenants take an intermediate position (Table 3). In every case, however, Negroes are worse off than whites. The

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Table 3. -Average Acreage per Farm and Average Value of Land and Buildings per Acre and per Farm in the South^a by Color and Tenure of Operator, 1920, 1930, and 1935

Tenure and color	Average acreage per farm			Average value per acre			Average value per farm		
	1920	1930	1935	1920	1930	1935	1920	1930	1935
Farm owners									
Colored	64.7	63.1	56.6	\$39.19	\$29.55	\$19.74	\$2,536	\$1,864	\$1,118
White	149.7	144.8	143.7	39.45	36.18	23.93	5,906	5,239	3,438
Tenants (other than croppers)									
Colored	45.2	46.1	51.3	55.20	34.79	19.63	2,498	1,602	1,008
White	102.7	112.5	114.4	49.93	37.05	23.33	5,129	4,168	2,554
Croppers									
Colored	30.4	30.5	31.2	72.07	45.97	27.11	2,190	1,400	845
White	54.5	51.2	52.8	60.27	43.21	26.63	3,284	2,213	1,406

^a/ South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central Divisions.

Sources: Fourteenth Census of the United States:1920, Agriculture Vol. V, pp. 193-196; and United States Census of Agriculture:1935, Vol. III, pp.126-132.

consequence is that, although in 1930 over one-fourth of all southern owners and tenants were Negroes, they operated but little more than one-tenth of all the farmland in the South.² The average value of the Negro owner-operated farms was less than that of farms operated by white sharecroppers. Particularly significant from a dynamic viewpoint is the fact that between 1920 and 1935 farm values declined even more drastically for Negro than white farm operators. This was mainly due to the change in acreage values. Formerly they were inversely correlated with tenure status—i.e., they were highest for cropper-operated and lowest for owner-operated land—but a certain equalization has taken place since 1920 so that by 1935 the difference between the owner and tenant groups had disappeared. In 1920 Negro sharecroppers resided on land which had a higher average acreage value than land operated by any of the other five color-tenure groups. This was still true in 1935, although the differences had become much smaller. All of these gradually changing differences in acreage values presumably have been largely due to the fact that the plantations which have been operated by sharecroppers and particularly Negro sharecroppers have contained much of the most valuable land in the South. The fact that the differences are becoming less pronounced means that the Negro farm operator is losing one of the few relative advantages that he used to have.

That Negroes are more concentrated than whites on plantations is

² U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Negroes in the United States, 1920-1932*, pp. 593-595.

borne out by Woofter's sample study for 1934.³ Among 646 cotton plantations 53 per cent had Negro tenants only, 42 per cent had both Negro and white tenants, and 5 per cent had white tenants only.⁴ Furthermore, Negro workers have concentrated their efforts on the main southern staple crops, particularly cotton, to a greater extent than whites. Three out of four of the Negro farm operators, as against two out of five of the white operators in the South, were designated as cotton farmers in 1930; i.e., at least 40 per cent of their gross income came from the production of cotton.⁵ In spite of the fact that Negro farmers operated only about one-tenth of the total farmland in the South, they nevertheless had a larger share of the total southern cotton production in 1929 (32 per cent)⁶ than the proportion they constituted of all southern farm operators in 1930 (27 per cent).

Moreover, it is believed that the plantations are employing a decreasing proportion of southern farm labor. Even the number of tenants increased less between 1900 and 1930 in counties which were designated as plantation counties in 1910 than in other southern counties.⁷ This is indicated by the following figures (see Appendix table 4):

Group of counties	Increase in number of tenants, 1900-1930		Per cent colored tenants constituted of all tenants	
	Number	Per cent	1900	1930
303 plantation counties.....	239,000	39	65	59
Other counties in 11 southern states.....	242,000	53	31	25

The main point, however, is that the Negro tenant has lost ground relatively speaking in both groups of counties. This is true for practically every state in the lower and upper South.

Data on cotton acreage and production of cotton (Appendix table 5) reveal some of the hazards brought about by the emphasis on

³ At the present writing there are no more recent census data on size of holding than those for 1910, when a special enumeration of plantations in 325 so-called plantation counties was made *Thirteenth Census of the United States: 1910, Agriculture Vol. V, Chapter 12*).

⁴ T. J. Woofter, Jr., and Others, *Landlord and Tenant on the Cotton Plantation*, Research Monograph V, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1936, p. 196.

⁵ U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Negroes in the United States, 1930-1932*, p. 587; and *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Agriculture Vol. III*, p. 12.

⁶ U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Negroes in the United States, 1920-1932*, p. 588.

⁷ It should be noted that even in the plantation counties a large part of the tenants were on small holdings; only a little more than half (54 per cent) of all tenants in 270 plantation counties in 1910 were on plantations with five or more tenants (T. J. Woofter, Jr., and Others, *op. cit.*, p. 195).

cash crops. There are at least three factors which should be considered in this context. One, of course, is the boll weevil, which crossed the Mississippi River about 1910 and during the following two decades caused so much damage that the Southeast had less land in farms, although slightly more improved land, in 1930 than in 1910.⁸ This blow to southeastern cotton production led to the emergence of the Southwest as a principal cotton-producing area. Texas and Oklahoma, which have a much smaller proportion of Negroes in the farm population than has the Southeast (Appendix table 6), had not far from half of the total cotton acreage and almost a third of the cotton production in 1929. Their relative importance has declined since then, but this has been partly compensated for by the increasing proportion of cotton grown in the Far West, where the acreage yields are much higher than in the South. Moreover, before the relative decline started in the Southwest, it had become apparent that there was a tremendous overproduction in cotton, which had been caused in part by the previous expansion in the Southwest and West and in part by the decline in foreign markets. This, in turn, necessitated the drastic reductions in acreage which were instituted under the AAA. The total land in cotton decreased from over 43,000,000 acres in 1929 to about 23,000,000 in 1939. Nevertheless, overproduction was not eliminated; for production declined to a lesser extent, or from about 15,000,000 bales to 12,000,000 bales. This apparently was due to a tendency to retain cotton on the best land and to intensify cultivation.

These recent changes are more or less revolutionizing the social structure of the southern agricultural population. Almost up to the time when the data from the 1940 census were released, the main emphasis was placed upon the increase in tenancy which had been noticeable ever since the Civil War, particularly among whites, and upon the decline in number of owners which became apparent during the twenties (Appendix table 6).⁹ It seemed as if a large proportion of landowners in the South were on their way to be reduced to tenants and sharecroppers or at least that the opportunities of getting into the landowning class were becoming restricted to an extent which was entirely incompatible with American ideals.¹⁰ The plight

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 15 and 39.

⁹ *Farm Tenancy*, Report of the President's Committee, prepared under the auspices of the National Resources Committee, Washington, February, 1937.

¹⁰ Data on percentage of owners by age show, however, that even Negroes, if they continued to work as farm operators until their old age, had an appreciable chance of becoming owners. They had to wait longer than whites though, for, in spite of the fact that Negroes die at an earlier age than whites, in 1930 there was

of the southern tenant under such conditions seemed the more significant and it was the subject of several penetrating studies, most of which, however, were confined to the conditions of the plantation tenant. It was shown that the sharecropper is more like an ordinary farm laborer than an independent operator, as assumed in the census statistics.¹¹ He has the advantage, however, over most wage laborers in southern agriculture of being employed on an annual basis, but his security is seldom guaranteed by a written lease.¹² Since he receives no monthly wages and rarely owns any capital or equipment of his own, the landlord must supply tools, fuel, work stock, feed, seed, and part of the fertilizer and furnish him, on a credit basis, with much of what he needs to support himself and his family until the settlement after the harvest.¹³ Therefore during a large part of the year he is indebted to his landlord. All accounts are kept by the landlord, and a Negro tenant generally is not even allowed to question them.¹⁴ The credit usually is acquired at a very high price. A flat interest rate of 10 per cent is usual; but since the average credit period is only a few months, the annual rate for tenants according to Woofter's

a greater proportion of persons forty-five years of age and over among colored (71 per cent) than white (64 per cent) owners in the South. It is furthermore evident that the chances of becoming owners had declined substantially since 1910 particularly for young farm operators of both racial groups.

Per Cent of Owners and Managers among Colored and White Farm Operators in the South, by Age, 1910 and 1930

Color	Year	All ages	Age in years					
			Under 25	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65 and over
Colored . . .	1910	24.7	7.1	14.7	22.8	32.2	38.1	44.7
	1930	20.9	3.4	9.0	18.0	25.9	33.7	44.6
White	1910	60.8	23.5	45.9	62.8	71.6	77.4	84.4
	1930	53.4	12.8	31.9	51.4	62.4	72.3	81.8

Source: *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Agriculture* Vol. IV, p. 316.

¹¹ C. O. Brannen, *Relation of Land Tenure to Plantation Organization*, Bulletin 1269, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, 1924, pp. 42-44; and E. A. Schuler, *Social Status and Farm Tenure—Attitudes and Social Conditions of Corn Belt and Cotton Belt Farmers*, Social Research Report No. 4, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration and Bureau of Agricultural Economics co-operating, Washington, 1936.

¹² T. J. Woofter, Jr., and Others, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

¹³ E. A. Boeger, and E. A. Goldenweiser, *A Study of the Tenant System of Farming in the Yazoo-Mississippi Delta*, Bulletin 337, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, 1916, pp. 6-7.

¹⁴ Arthur F. Raper, *Preface to Peasantry*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1936, p. 162.

sample study for 525 plantations averaged as much as 37 per cent in 1934.¹⁵ It frequently happens that the debts consume all that the sharecropper would receive for his half of the crop at the end of the year. During the years 1930-34, 10 to 13 per cent of the sharecroppers in Woofter's sample ended the year in debt;¹⁶ but the cropper often can get rid of such a debt simply by moving to another location, at least if he is without livestock or other property.¹⁷ Except for this feature, the sharecropper carries his full half of the entrepreneur's risk, although he is nothing but a common farm laborer.

Conditions like these affect not only sharecroppers, at least those on plantations, but, in a somewhat different form, other tenants as well. Such conditions are, of course, still prevalent, even though it does not appear that they are gaining in quantitative significance. The number of sharecroppers in the South declined by almost a third during the thirties or from 776,000 in 1930 to 541,000 in 1940. This tremendous change affected whites even more than Negroes, for the number of white sharecroppers declined by 141,000 and the number of colored sharecroppers by 94,000. The number of white cash and share tenants, on the other hand, was almost the same in 1940 as in 1930, but the colored workers in this tenure group declined by almost 100,000. There were about 134,000 more white owners in 1940 than in 1930, whereas the number of colored owners continued the slow decline that had started after 1920. Thus, by and large, the whites stood the pressure much better than the Negroes, the owners better than the tenants, and the cash and share tenants better than the sharecroppers.

It is scarcely probable that the increase in ownership and decrease in tenancy were compensatory to any large degree. An inspection of the figures for state and color groups indicates that this could be the case only to a limited extent. A more likely explanation is that the independent owners were less affected than other operators by the reductions in cash-crop acreage¹⁸ and that they had more opportunity

¹⁵ T. J. Woofter, Jr., and Others, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61.

¹⁷ There are still cases, however, in which an indebted tenant sometimes is forced to stay on the plantation as long as the landlord wants him, or until the debt has been paid. (See, for example, Allison Davis, Burleigh B. Gardner, and Mary R. Gardner, *Deep South; A Social Anthropological Study of Caste and Class*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1941, pp. 351-352.) It is probable, though, that such practices became less prevalent during the thirties, owing to the relatively good supply of farm labor.

¹⁸ In 1930 about 36 per cent of the full owners in the South, as against 6 per cent of the croppers, operated farms which were either general (no single crop

to stay on their farms if, in view of the paucity of migratory outlets, they preferred to do that. The increase in the proportion of owners among both Negro and white operators, therefore, scarcely means that the situation has been ameliorated. By and large it is rather the other way around. While the limitations in the opportunities in southern agriculture formerly caused an increase in tenancy, they now seem to have been aggravated to such an extent that the Negro and white sharecropping class as well as the Negro cash and share tenants are in the process of being forced out.

It is not yet known to what extent former sharecroppers and tenants have been given the opportunity to stay on the farms as wage laborers.¹⁹ Even if they had all been given this opportunity, this would not represent full compensation since wage laborers usually have less steady employment and lower incomes.²⁰ In the case of Negroes at least it is probable that only part of the tenants have been provided for in this way, for it has been shown that the total colored farm population declined between 1930 and 1940 (Table 1).

It should be reiterated, however, that the movement of Negroes off the farm certainly is due not to one single cause but to a combination of various factors, some of which are difficult to evaluate whereas others are easier to appraise, at least in a general way. Income differentials, real or imaginary, have played a large role, but whether they have had more influence on Negro than on white migration is more uncertain. The fact that the rural Negro is kept in a particularly dependent position and that urban areas, especially in the North, offer the Negro comparatively good facilities in regard to education and medical care may have tipped the balance in many individual cases, although no one can tell precisely how effective such factors are. The best known of the factors causing migration was the development

accounting for as much as 40 per cent of the gross income) or self-sufficing. *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Agriculture Vol. III, State table VII.*

¹⁹ It is not certain that there has been any very great decrease in the labor requirements in cotton culture. The reductions in acreage have been counteracted by increased yields, and there are certain calculations which indicate that the labor requirements in cotton depend mainly on the size of the production and not on the acreage (William C. Holley, Ellen Winston, and T. J. Woofter, Jr., *The Plantation South, 1934-1937*, Work Projects Administration, Washington, 1940, p. 116). The AAA system, however, has given the landlords an interest in reducing tenants to day laborers, since they have to share the AAA benefits with their tenants but not with their wage laborers. It is widely recognized that this circumstance has been at least a contributing factor to the decline in number of cotton tenants. (See, for example, Carl T. Schmidt, *American Farmers in the World Crisis*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1941, p. 265.)

²⁰ See Chapter V.

during the first World War of new openings for Negroes in northern industries. This factor could scarcely have been of much significance during the thirties, but the institution in 1933 of large-scale public relief in this country seems to provide one of the main explanations why Negroes have continued to move away from the farms during the last decade. True, there are residence requirements for eligibility for relief;²¹ but the prospective migrant may be ignorant about them or hope to be able to get around them. Even when settlement is rigidly enforced, it is quite probable that the North-South and urban-rural differentials in regard to both availability of relief and average relief benefits may influence migration. This influence must be more pronounced for Negroes than for whites for two reasons: first, the differentials in regional and local relief standards are more marked in the case of the Negro;²² second and more important, there is a greater proportion of Negroes than whites who are in need of relief.

The proportion of relief recipients among Negro families in the urban North has frequently exceeded 40 or even 50 per cent. The corresponding figures for most southern cities usually have been significantly lower, and the rural Negroes always have had a particularly disadvantaged position in this respect. It should be noted in this context that the proportion of families which have either received relief sometime during their existence or have to reckon with a serious risk of becoming in need of public assistance must be significantly higher than the proportion of relief cases at any given time. It is not only those families actually receiving or in need of public assistance which may be inclined to consider local differences in relief. Those who look upon themselves as prospective relief clients have a similar interest and they more often have the economic opportunity to migrate. These two groups, judged by northern relief standards, no doubt encompass a majority of the Negro population. Therefore, residence requirements probably cannot do more than reduce the inducement to migrate that the local variations in relief conditions provide, particularly in the case of the Negro. It must be economically worth while to move in a great number of cases, even if relief cannot be obtained in the new residence for one, two, or three years.

²¹ The Work Projects Administration does not have residence requirements, but there is, of course, the question of whether an individual will be able to get on the rolls in a new location. If he is already on WPA, this is probably a deterrent to any move which would involve loss of WPA status.

²² See Part II.

NEGRO GAINS IN NONAGRICULTURAL PURSUITS

The migration of Negroes to northern industrial areas gives added emphasis to the problem of their employment opportunities. Will they obtain a real place in the nonagricultural economy or are they merely exchanging their position as sharecroppers and wage workers in agriculture for that of urban unemployed workers and relief clients? Occupational data are not yet available for 1940 so that the main emphasis must be upon rates of employment and unemployment, which are analyzed in the next section. The trends in nonagricultural employment for the period 1910-30 are of particular interest, however, because those years gave the Negro his greatest opportunity, prior to the recent defense boom, to make gains in nonagricultural pursuits.

Between 1910 and 1930, while Negro males were giving up or losing close to 300,000 jobs in agriculture, they were gaining 775,000 jobs²³ in nonagricultural industries (Appendix table 2). About 480,000 of these new jobs were in the North and West and 295,000 in the South.²⁴ Yet about 1,340,000 or more than three out of every five Negro male workers in nonagricultural pursuits were still in the South in 1930, whereas the number of those residing outside the South was about 830,000.

The absolute increase in nonagricultural employment was greater between 1910 and 1930 than between 1890 and 1910 (about 550,000), but the difference was not as great as one would have expected considering the fact that the Negro farm population still had been increasing before 1910 and was decreasing afterward. Moreover, the relative increase in number of Negro males in nonagricultural pursuits was actually larger between 1890 and 1910 (almost 70 per cent) than between 1910 and 1930 (56 per cent).²⁵ The latter rate, on the other hand, was higher than the corresponding increase between 1910 and 1930 for all races combined (46 per cent).²⁶ This difference was due entirely to the development in the North. In the South, where the total number of male workers in

²³ This expression is somewhat inexact since in all census counts up to 1930 the workers were classified according to their usual occupation, regardless of whether they actually were employed at the time of the census or not.

²⁴ U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Negroes in the United States, 1920-1932*, pp. 303-309; and *Negro Population in the United States, 1790-1915*, pp. 513-516.

²⁵ It should be recalled, however, that there possibly was a tendency in the 1910 census to register many persons as workers who were not so registered at the previous and subsequent census enumeration.

²⁶ *Thirteenth Census of the United States: 1910*, Population Vol. IV, p. 91; and *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1938*, p. 57.

nonagricultural industries increased much more (62 per cent)²⁷ than for the country as a whole, the relative gain for Negro males was comparatively limited (28 per cent). Because of that fact the proportion of Negro workers among all male nonagricultural workers in the South declined from 27 per cent in 1910 to 21 per cent in 1930. Thus Negroes received much less than their proportionate share of the industrial and commercial expansion in the South between 1910 and 1930. They were beginning to leave the South when the South really had new opportunities to offer, at least to whites. In some of the southern states—viz., Virginia, Arkansas, and Kentucky—there was practically no increase at all in the number of Negro male workers in nonagricultural pursuits during this period (Table 4). In the case

Table 4. - Negro Male Workers in Nonagricultural Pursuits, 1910 and 1930, in States with 100,000 Negro Population or More in 1930 (in thousands)

State	1910	1930	State	1910	1930	State	1910	1930
New York	46	141	Maryland	46	71	Kentucky	53	51
New Jersey	26	63	District of Columbia	29	42	Tennessee	76	90
Pennsylvania	64	145	Virginia	103	107	Alabama	97	129
Ohio	36	101	West Virginia	24	37	Mississippi	63	72
Indiana	19	37	North Carolina	72	106	Arkansas	41	43
Illinois	39	113	South Carolina	55	72	Louisiana	88	114
Michigan	5	61	Georgia	120	145	Oklahoma	19	26
Missouri	46	65	Florida	71	97	Texas	82	130

Sources: U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Negro Population in the United States, 1790-1915*, pp. 513-522; and *Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930*, Population Vol. IV, State table 11.

of Arkansas this is scarcely surprising, since this state failed to share in the general expansion of nonagricultural industries; but Kentucky had some part of it, and Virginia had about 60 per cent more white males in nonagricultural industries in 1930 than in 1910.²⁸

The bulk of the gain for Negroes was in manufacturing and mechanical industries, transportation and trade, which had 956,000 Negro males in 1910 and 1,488,000 in 1930 (Appendix table 2). This increase by over 530,000, however, was not much larger than the corresponding increase between 1890 and 1910 (Appendix table 1), when northern industries did not provide so much of a migratory outlet for Negroes as was the case during the period 1910-30. It should be noted, however, that the relative gain was greater for

²⁷ *Thirteenth Census of the United States: 1910*, Population Vol. IV, p. 36; and *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1938*, p. 67.

²⁸ *Thirteenth Census of the United States: 1910*, Population Vol. IV, pp. 96-151; and *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930*, Population Vol. III, State table 20.

Negro males than for whites both in manufacturing and in transportation, whereas trade showed a greater rate of increase in the white than the colored labor force. Almost one-third (31 per cent) of all Negro male workers in 1930 belonged to these three groups of non-agricultural industries; but there was still a substantial race differential in this regard, for the same groups accounted for a large majority (57 per cent) of the white male workers. The only major group of nonagricultural industries which gave employment in 1930 to a considerably greater proportion of Negro (12 per cent) than white (4 per cent) male workers was domestic and personal service. These occupations showed a considerable expansion between 1920 and 1930 from which Negro males profited more than white males.

Contrary to the trends in the male group, the development for females in nonagricultural occupations during 1910-30 was characterized by a greater increase among white workers (59 per cent) than among Negro workers (40 per cent). As explained in the next section, this is largely a result of an equalization in the rates of gainful employment, which have been rising for white females but are stationary or slowly declining for Negro females. This difference may be due, in part, to the paucity of more worth-while job opportunities for Negro women. Over 1,150,000 Negro women in 1930 were in domestic and personal service; less than 200,000 earned their living in other nonagricultural pursuits. It was only in domestic and personal service that the absolute increase between 1910 and 1930 in number of Negro female workers was really substantial (over 360,000). White women, on the other hand, have shown spectacular increases in many occupational groups in which the number of Negro women has remained insignificant. There were between three and four times as many white women in clerical occupations in 1930 as in 1910 and twice as many in trade and transportation. Of all white female workers in 1930, 22 per cent belonged to the former group and 14 per cent to the latter two groups; but the corresponding figures for Negro females were less than 1 per cent in each case. Negro females, however, made some gains in manufacturing and mechanical industries as well as in professional service; yet the absolute numbers in these groups were only 101,000 and 63,000, respectively, by 1930 and the former figure had ceased to increase after 1920.

One of the reasons Negroes, particularly those who stayed in the South, failed to make large gains in nonagricultural occupations was that so many of them were in industries which showed little or no

general development during the period 1910-30.²⁹ This is borne out by a more refined industrial classification (Appendix table 7). Saw and planing mills constitute one of the principal Negro industries. In the South they are second to none in the manufacturing group as a source of employment for Negroes, for very few of their 114,000 Negro workers (constituting 25 per cent of the total in the industry) resided elsewhere. They showed practically no change in labor force between 1910 and 1930. The turpentine farms and distilleries are less significant (34,000 Negro workers in 1930) but had the highest proportion of Negroes in their labor force of all manufacturing industries (75 per cent). They showed some increase for white workers but practically none for Negroes between 1910 and 1930. Independent hand trades had a similar number of Negro workers in 1930 (28,000, of which 20,000 were seamstresses). This labor force was only half of what it had been in 1910. There were 362,000 Negro home laundresses in 1910, of whom 333,000 were in the South. Largely because of competition from the commercial laundries, this number had declined by 25 per cent or to 269,000 by 1930.³⁰ There could scarcely have been much compensatory gain, for while the home laundresses were 75 per cent Negro this was true of only 20 per cent (40 per cent in the South³¹) of the workers in the commercial laundries in 1930.

Most important to Negroes among those manufacturing industries which have a large proportion of their Negro workers in the North is the building industry, which had 181,000 Negro workers in 1930. The total labor force had remained almost unchanged since 1910, but

²⁹ Some of the industries which became stationary after 1910 had shown great increases in number of Negro workers during the previous two decades. This is borne out by the following table, in which are listed the industries and occupations showing the most notable increases in number of Negro male workers between 1890 and 1910.

Industry and occupation	Number of male Negro workers	
	1890	1910
Mines and quarrymen.....	19,000	61,000
Building trades (except laborers).....	43,000	77,000
Iron and steel workers.....	19,000	48,000
Saw and planing mill workers.....	17,000	108,000
Steam railroad employees.....	47,000	103,000
Draymen, hackmen, teamsters.....	44,000	97,000
Porters and helpers in stores.....	12,000	44,000
Servants and waiters.....	102,000	176,000

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Negro Population in the United States, 1790-1915*, pp. 526-527.

³⁰ *Thirteenth Census of the United States: 1910*, Population Vol. IV, pp. 434-534, and *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930*, Population Vol. V, Table 3.

³¹ Includes also workers in cleaning, dyeing, and pressing shops. *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930*, Population Vol. III, p. 23.

the number of Negro workers declined by 23 per cent. The clay, glass, and stone industries (29,000 Negro workers) were relatively stationary for both Negro and white workers.

There were some cases, however, when even stagnating or declining industries gave an increased number of jobs to Negroes, at least up until 1930. This was true, for instance of coal mines (58,000 Negro workers in 1930), which had over 40 per cent more Negro workers in 1930 than in 1910 but practically no change in the total labor force. The cigar and tobacco factories (34,000 Negroes, of which 31,000 were in the South) showed a decrease of 23 per cent in the total but an increase of 35 per cent in Negro man power. The steam railroads (163,000 Negro workers, of which more than one-third were in the North and West) had about the same total personnel in 1930 as in 1910 but 25 per cent more Negro workers.

Most of the large gains for Negro workers were made in industries which were expanding. Construction, maintenance of roads, etc., had 64,000 Negro workers in 1930, three-fourths of whom were in the South. The total man power had increased by over 90 per cent since 1910. The Negro increase had been almost as large (74 per cent). The fertilizer factories experienced a doubling of their total man power between 1910 and 1930, and the Negroes received slightly more than their proportionate share of this development; but the total number of Negro workers in this industry was still not large by 1930 (17,000) although Negroes had 60 per cent of all the jobs. More significant was the increase in the number of Negro schoolteachers from 29,000 in 1910²² to 54,000 in 1930. This change was brought about mainly by the development of the segregated southern school system. Some of the most spectacular gains, however, were made in expanding industries, which allowed the Negro to gain a comparatively strong foothold in the North. The outstanding examples are the iron and steel industries, which had 177,000 Negro workers in 1930, 60 per cent of whom were in the North and West; 53,000 of these workers were in blast furnaces and steel rolling mills and 26,000 in automobile factories. The total man power in the whole group had almost doubled since 1910, but the number of Negro workers was between three and four times greater in 1930 than in 1910. Garages and such establishments (44,000 workers in 1930) constitute a similar case, as do slaughter and packing houses (18,000) and the clothing industries (35,000). Wholesale and retail trade, except automobiles (192,000), showed a smaller relative gain for Negroes (58 per cent), but the absolute

²² *Thirteenth Census of the United States: 1910, Population Vol. IV, p. 431.*

increase was considerable. Other interesting examples are postal service (18,000) and public service, not elsewhere classified (62,000). The fact that two-thirds of the Negro post-office employees resided outside the South shows that the federal government even in its own administration may fail in its intention to give the southern Negro a square deal.

In addition to the fact that several of the industries which employ large numbers of Negroes have been declining, it is particularly the failure of so many large and expanding industrial groups to give any appreciable proportion of the jobs to Negroes that explains the limitations in the job opportunities of the nonagricultural Negro (Table 5). In the textile industry, which had one-third of its labor

Table 5. - Expanding Nonagricultural Industries with 150,000 Workers or More, of whom Less than 4 Per Cent Were Negroes in 1930

Industry and service group	Number of workers		Index (1910=100)	Negro workers as per cent of all workers,	
	1930			1930	
	United States	The South		United States	The South
Manufacturing and mechanical industries					
Textile industries	1,183,000	383,000	132	2.2	5.4
Paper, printing and allied industries	788,000	102,000	161	2.2	7.8
Electrical machinery and supply factories	384,000	19,000	431	0.6	3.1
Electrical light and power plants	289,000	a/	419	2.6	a/
Bakeries	282,000	45,000	195	3.3	11.8
Shoe factories	271,000	14,000	125	0.8	3.9
Furniture factories	268,000	b/	167	3.0	b/
Rubber factories	166,000	9,000	286	2.1	8.0
Other nonagricultural industries					
Wholesale and retail trade, except automobiles	5,353,000	1,174,000	150	3.6	10.3
Insurance and real estate	795,000	146,000	261	1.9	5.7
Banking and brokerage	625,000	99,000	297	1.4	4.5
Telegraph and telephone	579,000	106,000	215	0.7	2.2
Automobile agencies, stores and filling stations	498,000	a/	10,841	2.4	a/
Oil wells and gas wells	198,000	118,000	339	0.5	1.2
Street railroads	195,000	27,000	106	3.6	9.1

a/ Data not available.

b/ Data not available. Furniture and other woodworking factories, except saw and planing mills, had 409,000 workers, of which 92,000 were in the South. In this combined group 6 per cent were Negro workers (in the South 22 per cent). Over two-thirds of the Negroes were in "other" woodworking factories.

Sources: Thirteenth Census of the United States:1910, Population Vol. IV, pp. 302-402; and Fifteenth Census of the United States:1930, Population Vol. III, p. 23, and Population Vol. V, pp. 408-411.

force in the South, Negroes accounted for only 2 per cent of the workers in 1930. Although more than half of the workers in the oil and gas wells were in the South, only about one in two hundred of them was a Negro. Other significant groups with a low proportion of Negro workers were relatively less concentrated in the South, but several of them nevertheless had a fair representation there.

This was true, for example, of paper, printing, and allied industries; bakeries; furniture and certain other woodworking factories; telegraph and telephone companies; banking and brokerage; insurance and real estate; wholesale and retail trade. In the case of factories producing electrical machinery and supplies and shoes and rubber, on the other hand, the South can accept but little responsibility for the low proportion of Negro workers, for these industries have been quite insignificant in the South.

The Negro gains in nonagricultural pursuits should, of course, be appraised not only from a quantitative but also from a qualitative point of view, but an adequate appraisal of the latter kind cannot be made without a detailed occupational analysis. The socio-economic grouping made by Alba M. Edwards (Table 6) provides a summarized substitute for such an analysis. Although it is based on census data, which are not always adequate for determining the status of workers, it is generally believed to give a rather accurate picture of the general conditions.

Of all male Negro workers in nonagricultural pursuits in 1930, 69 per cent were designated as unskilled, whereas the corresponding proportion of all workers was 25 per cent. These percentages, however, were somewhat lower in both cases than in 1910 (74 and 31 per cent, respectively). The compensatory increase for Negroes occurred almost entirely in the semiskilled group, which encompassed 11 per cent of the gainfully employed Negro males in 1910 and 15 per cent in 1930. For the total labor force, on the other hand, the increase in the proportion of clerks and kindred workers (from 14 to 17 per cent) was even greater than that for semiskilled workers (from 17 to 19 per cent). All other changes were relatively insignificant. Thus, although the position of the Negro on the occupational ladder appeared to be slightly improved, this was true only in an absolute sense. In relation to other workers, his position, if anything, was rather worse than before. The whole increase in the proportion that Negro workers constituted of all workers in nonagricultural pursuits occurred in unskilled and semiskilled occupations. The Negro's share in all other male jobs remained almost precisely as insignificant as it had been in 1910. There were 1,171,000 more male unskilled workers in 1930 than in 1910; 40 per cent of these workers were Negroes. Of the 2,121,000 additional semiskilled workers, 8 per cent were Negroes. The total increase in number of skilled, clerical, managerial, and professional male workers amounted to 5,739,000 persons, of whom only 2 per cent were Negroes.

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Table 6. - Male Workers in Nonagricultural Occupations, by Socio-economic Status and Race, 1910 and 1930

Socio-economic group	Number (in thousands)				Per cent distribution by socio-economic status						Negroes as per cent of all workers	
	All races		Negro		All races		Negro		1910	1930	1910	1930
	1910	1930	1910	1930	1910	1930	1910	1930				
All groups	19,552	28,582	1,396	2,172	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			7.1	7.6
Professional persons	914	1,498	36	56	4.7	5.2	2.6				3.9	3.7
Proprietors, managers, officials	2,324	3,411	33	46	11.9	11.9	2.4				1.4	1.3
Clerks and kindred workers	2,744	4,877	32	62	14.0	17.1	2.3				1.2	1.3
Skilled workers and foremen	4,267	6,202	114	176	21.8	21.7	8.2				2.7	2.8
Semi-skilled workers	3,327	5,448	149	329	17.0	19.1	10.6				4.5	6.0
Unskilled workers	5,976	7,147	1,032	1,504	30.6	25.0	73.9				17.3	21.0

Source: Alba M. Edwards, A Social-Economic Grouping of the Gainful Workers of the United States, U. S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, 1938, pp. 7 and 13.

Chapter III

OCCUPATIONAL AND EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

Employment and Unemployment

The extent of employment and unemployment among Negroes and the related factors shed additional light on their occupational adjustments.

THE LABOR FORCE

Data on employment and unemployment can be related either to the total population above a certain age or to that portion of the population which constitutes the available labor force; that is, those who either have gainful employment or are seeking such employment. For most purposes the latter comparison is the more significant. The labor force, however, accounts for different proportions of the population at different times. For this reason data on variations in the relative size of the available labor supply are pertinent.

The definition of gainful worker used in census reports prior to 1940 agrees fairly well with that of labor force. According to the instructions to the enumerators of the 1930 census, gainful workers include persons who "usually have an occupation but happen to be idle or unemployed at the time of the visit" of the enumerator.¹ The proportion of gainful workers was higher in the Negro than the white population during the entire period 1890 to 1930 (Table 7). The difference was not great with regard to males (80 and 76 per cent, respectively, in 1930), but it was marked in the case of females (39 and 20 per cent, respectively). The greater poverty of Negroes forces the female members of the family into the labor market much more often than is the case among whites. White women showed a

¹ The fact that the definition does not include job seekers who have never had employment is not very significant. According to the preliminary returns of the 1940 census this group constituted only 0.8 per cent of the total population 14 years of age and over (*Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 4*).

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Table 7. — Proportion of All Persons 10 Years of Age and Over Gainfully Employed, by Section, Color, and Sex, 1890-1930

Section and year	Gainful workers as per cent of all persons 10 years of age and over			
	Negro		White	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
United States total				
1890	79.4	36.2	76.9	14.4
1900	84.1	40.7	79.5	16.0
1910	87.4	54.7	80.6	19.6
1920	81.1	38.9	77.9	19.2
1930	80.2	35.9	75.8	20.3
The North				
1890	a/	a/	77.5	15.9
1900	82.1	36.2	79.0	17.5
1910	85.6	45.6	79.8	20.7
1920	86.5	40.8	78.4	21.0
1930	82.5	40.4	75.9	21.7
The South				
1890	a/	a/	73.7	10.0
1900	84.3	41.3	80.5	11.8
1910	87.6	56.0	82.5	17.2
1920	80.0	35.5	76.3	14.6
1930	79.6	38.5	75.1	16.1

a/ Data not available.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Decennial Reports.

definite trend toward an increased rate of gainful work, however, whereas Negro women failed to show any consistent change in any direction.² Thus there was a tendency toward a slight reduction in the race differential.

Large urban areas showed a small decline between 1900 and 1930 in the proportion of Negro women who were gainful workers (Table 8). This was due in part to the northward migration, for

Table 8. — Proportion of All Females 10 Years of Age and Over Gainfully Employed in 1900 and 1930 in Cities with 50,000 Population or More in 1900 and 100,000 Population or More in 1930, by Section and Color

Section	Gainful workers as per cent of all females 10 years of age and over			
	Negro		White	
	1900	1930	1900	1930
United States total ...	49.4	45.3	24.4	27.9
The North	44.1	44.1	25.1	27.8
The South	53.8	50.4	20.0	27.2

Sources: Twelfth Census of the United States: 1900; and Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. V.

the Negro rate was consistently higher in southern than northern cities. Among white women, in contrast, the proportion of gainful workers was lower in the South than in the North in 1900, while the North-South rates were about the same in 1930.

² It should be recalled that the peak in 1910 was mainly due to technical reasons. See p. 10, footnote 1.

The reduction in the general race differential between white and Negro females was largely brought about through a rise in the rates for white women in the 20-24 and 25-44 year age groups (Table 9). The proportion of female gainful workers in the former age class was almost as high for whites (42 per cent) in 1930 as for Negroes (46 per cent), but there was still a sharp difference in age of withdrawal from the labor market. After the age of 25, white women continued to leave the labor market in great numbers, whereas Negro women continued to work until they were about 65 years of age.

The proportion of male gainful workers showed a small decline between 1900 and 1930 among both whites and Negroes. This was due entirely to changes in the youngest (10-19 years) and oldest (65 years and over) age groups. The reduction was most substantial among children 10-15 years of age. Both male and female child labor was almost wiped out among the whites, but among Negroes there still was a substantial group of child workers (20 per cent among the boys and 12 per cent among the girls) in 1930. The decline in the rates for males 65 years old and over was not very large for either Negroes or whites, as 75 per cent of the Negro men of this age group and 57 per cent of the white group were registered as gainful workers in 1930 in comparison with 85 per cent and 67 per cent, respectively, in 1900. Among aged women the race differential was somewhat reduced in that the Negro rate dropped from 29 per cent in 1900 to 24 per cent in 1930, whereas the white rate remained constant at the low level of 7 per cent.

Earlier trends persisted during the decade 1930-40 (Tables 9 and 10)⁸ in some cases at an accelerated rate. Retirement at 65 years of age had become much more common, presumably because of the introduction of old-age assistance and old-age insurance and also as a result of the depression during the thirties. Less than half of the colored male workers 65 years of age and over belonged to the labor force in 1940, and the corresponding proportion for Negro female workers was only 12 per cent. The race differential in this respect

⁸ All comparisons between 1930 and 1940 have to be made with caution since the concepts "gainful worker" and "labor force" are not identical. "Certain classes of persons such as retired workers, some inmates of institutions, recently incapacitated workers, and seasonal workers neither working nor seeking work at the time of the census, were frequently included among gainful workers in 1930, but in general such persons are not in the 1940 labor force. On the other hand, the 1940 census includes in the labor force persons seeking work without previous work experience. . . ." (*Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940*, Preliminary releases, Series P-4a, No. 11, p. 3.) It is quite possible, for instance, that the decline in the rates for male workers, particularly pronounced in the case of Negroes, may be partly due to the exclusion of seasonal workers in 1940.

Table 9. - Proportion of All Persons 10 Years of Age and Over Gainfully Employed, by Age, Sex, and Color, 1900, 1920, 1930

Age	Gainful workers as per cent of all persons									
	Male					Female				
	Negro		White			Negro		White		
	1900	1920	1930	1900	1920	1930	1900	1920	1930	1900
10 years and over....	84.1	81.1	80.2	79.5	77.9	75.8	40.7	38.9	16.0	19.2
10-15 years	49.3	26.7	20.3	22.5	9.4	4.7	30.6	17.1	7.3	4.0
16-19 years a/.....	85.6	76.0	71.2	75.6	67.1	53.7	49.6	40.5	29.5	36.5
20-24 years b/.....	93.6	93.5	93.5	93.1	90.8	89.5	45.6	46.0	28.6	37.3
25-44 years	95.9	97.3	96.9	96.5	97.2	97.5	41.7	45.2	15.3	19.9
45-64 years	96.5	97.2	96.1	93.2	93.5	93.9	41.8	45.7	11.3	14.8
65 years and over ...	84.9	80.2	74.7	66.9	58.6	57.3	28.5	27.1	7.3	6.7

a/ The data for 1900 refer to the age group 15-20 years.

b/ The data for 1900 refer to the age group 21-24 years.

Sources: Twelfth Census of the United States: 1900; Fourteenth Census of the United States: 1920, Vol. IV; and Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. V.

was smaller than in 1930. The Negro male rate in urban areas was slightly lower even (36 per cent) than the white rate (38 per cent), and there was a substantial difference of this type in some of the large northern cities (Appendix table 8) in which relief benefits are comparatively high and unemployment among Negroes has been particularly serious.

In the case of minors also the proportions declined more rapidly for Negroes than for whites. The percentage of boys 14-19 years old in the labor force in the North was slightly lower among Negroes than whites in 1940 in most cases (Appendix table 9). Among girls similar conditions had already prevailed in the North in 1930. In the South, on the other hand, the proportion of colored boys and girls that belonged to the labor force, although substantially reduced by 1940, was still considerably higher than that for white boys and girls. This probably was not due to conditions in rural areas only, for a comparison with the general urban rates (Table 10) suggests that the situation was similar in urban areas as well, at least for males.

Also for other groups besides old and young people the proportions in the labor force declined between 1930 and 1940, and this change, too, was particularly marked in the case of Negroes. In the North the male rates for every age group were lower for Negroes than for whites, and similar conditions prevailed in some cases in the South (Appendix table 9). The data for females reveal a strong continued tendency toward a gradual elimination of the original race differential, in that the white rates consistently increased and the colored rates tended to decline.⁴ There was still a considerable difference, however. While 46 per cent of the colored females in urban areas belonged to the labor force in 1940, the corresponding figure for white females was 30 per cent (Table 10). The rate for colored females probably was much higher in the urban South than in the urban North.⁵

⁴ Whereas in 1930 colored females did not begin to leave the labor market in large numbers until about 65 years of age, in 1940 there was a substantial reduction in their willingness to work from the age of 45 or slightly later.

⁵ Since only a small proportion of the colored rural population resides elsewhere than in the South, an approximate figure for the urban South can be calculated by subtracting the data for the nonwhite rural population (*Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940*, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 4) from those for the total South (*ibid.*, Series P-4a, Nos. 14-16). The proportion of colored women who belonged to the labor force, according to such a calculation for the urban South, was 55 per cent, whereas the corresponding figure for northern divisions, where the colored population is almost entirely urban, ranged from 44 per cent in the Middle Atlantic states to 32 per cent in the West North Central states (Appendix table 9).

A closer examination of the rural-urban and farm-nonfarm data (Table 10) reveals significant differences. The proportions of boys

Table 10. - Proportion of All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over in the Labor Force, by Sex, Age, Residence, and Color, March 24-30, 1940

Sex and age	Persons in the labor force as per cent of all persons							
	Total		Rural-farm		Rural-nonfarm		Urban	
	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White
Male								
14 years and over ...	79.9	78.9	83.2	80.6	74.0	75.1	79.9	79.6
14-19 years	46.0	33.3	55.7	42.0	41.9	31.5	37.1	29.8
20-24 years	88.5	88.2	91.6	89.9	82.8	87.8	88.2	87.6
25-44 years	92.0	94.9	94.4	95.6	86.5	92.8	92.6	95.5
45-64 years	88.0	88.9	94.0	92.7	81.9	83.9	86.2	89.1
65 years and over ...	48.7	41.2	67.5	57.9	37.5	31.2	36.0	37.7
Female								
14 years and over ...	37.6	24.2	24.4	10.7	33.2	19.5	46.1	29.8
14-19 years	22.1	16.4	21.2	10.4	20.2	15.3	23.6	23.1
20-24 years	45.1	45.5	29.8	22.7	39.3	34.9	56.5	55.3
25-44 years	45.6	28.4	25.8	10.9	40.1	22.3	55.3	35.0
45-64 years	36.6	18.4	25.7	7.8	34.8	16.5	42.9	22.1
65 years and over....	12.1	5.2	13.2	4.4	10.5	4.2	12.0	5.6

Sources: Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 4.

14-19 years of age and of old men, 65 years of age and over, that belonged to the labor force were much higher in farm than nonfarm areas. No less than 56 per cent of the colored boys in farm areas and 68 per cent of the colored aged men were workers or job seekers. Comparable figures for whites were 42 per cent and 58 per cent, respectively. Among rural-farm women, on the other hand, only a comparatively small proportion of either colored or white women at any age was statistically registered as belonging to the labor force. The low figures, however, are partly fictitious. It is a well-known fact that female work in and around farm homes includes many chores necessary for ordinary agricultural production, and it is scarcely possible in this case consistently to draw the line between workers and nonworkers.

Data from the urban sample of the National Health Survey of 1935-36 (Appendix table 10) and from the Unemployment Check Census of 1937 (Appendix table 11) in general corroborate the conclusions already drawn on the basis of the data from the population censuses. There are some discrepancies in the results, however, probably caused both by minor differences in enumeration techniques and by the difference in time of year. Both the 1935-36 and the 1937 studies indicate, for instance, that the relative number of males in the labor force was higher than the results shown in the 1940 census. The 1937 Census of Unemployment shows a greater

proportion of women who were working or available for work than the other two sources. Both studies, however, give substantially the same picture of race differentials as the census data previously presented.

THE NONWORKERS

For a better understanding of the data on the relative size of the labor force, it seems appropriate to devote some attention to the composition of that part of the population which is not willing or able to become part of the labor force.

The largest single group consists of women who are reported as engaged in housework in their own homes. According to the preliminary returns from the 1940 census (Table 11), these women constituted 42 per cent of all colored and 58 per cent of all white females 14 years of age and over. The colored rate was higher than the white rate for women 14-19 years old. The rates were the same for the age group 20-24 years, but thereafter the white rate rose rapidly while the colored rate remained about the same. The age group 45-64 years contained the highest proportion of women engaged in housework in their own homes (50 per cent of the colored women and 74 per cent of the white women) and had a more pronounced race differential than the younger age groups.

Second in numerical importance are the persons in school (Table 12). In view of the fact that Negroes are so much poorer than whites and furthermore are largely concentrated in areas where educational facilities are below the average for the country and often particularly inadequate for Negroes, one would expect these figures to reveal rather substantial race differentials. This, however, was not the case. The proportion of colored persons 14 years of age and over who were in school (8 per cent for males and 9 per cent for females) was scarcely lower than the corresponding white figure (9 per cent for both sexes). Even in the South, where the colored group includes few representatives of races other than the Negro race, the differences were rather insignificant. Part of the explanation is, of course, that the younger age groups constitute a larger proportion of the colored than the white population.⁶ The age-specific rates, for this reason, revealed a somewhat more significant racial difference. The rate for colored males 14-19 years of age was 44 per cent as compared with 58 per cent for white males in the same age group.

⁶ Differences in the age composition of the population also explain to some extent why the rural rates are as high as the urban rates.

Table 11. - Females 14 Years of Age and Over Not in the Labor Force and Engaged in Housework ^{a/} as Per Cent of All Females, by Residence, Age, Geographic Division, and Color, 1940

Residence, age, and geographic division	Females not in labor force and engaged in housework as per cent of all females		Residence, age, and geographic division	Females not in labor force and engaged in housework as per cent of all females	
	Nonwhite	White		Nonwhite	White
United States total ...	42.3	58.3	Rural-nonfarm (cont.)		
14-19 years	20.4	15.7	45-64 years	50.4	74.6
20-24 years	45.6	45.6	65 years and over	34.0	57.5
25-44 years	48.1	67.5			
45-64 years	49.8	74.4	Urban	34.2	53.5
65 years and over...	32.2	56.0	14-19 years	14.7	9.8
			20-24 years	34.4	36.0
Rural-farm	55.3	70.4	25-44 years	37.9	61.3
14-19 years	25.2	26.4	45-64 years	41.0	70.6
20-24 years	60.8	67.3	65 years and over	27.1	54.5
25-44 years	69.5	85.2			
45-64 years	65.9	86.7	Middle Atlantic division		
65 years and over...	38.7	59.4	East North Central division	36.2	54.9
			West North Central division	45.1	59.5
Rural-nonfarm	45.5	61.6	South Atlantic division	47.0	61.2
14-19 years	23.8	18.9	East South Central division	39.7	57.6
20-24 years	50.9	56.2	West South Central division	44.8	64.0
25-44 years	52.6	72.8		45.8	63.2

^{a/} In own home.

Source: Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 4, and Series P-4a, Nos. 11-16.

The corresponding figures for females were 48 and 58 per cent, respectively. The proportions for the age group 20-24 years, which

Table 12. - Proportion of All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over in School, by Residence, Age, Geographic Division, Sex, and Color, 1940

Residence, age, and geographic division	Per cent in school			
	Male		Female	
	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White
United States total	7.9	9.2	8.7	8.9
Rural-farm	8.3	9.4	10.6	10.7
Rural-nonfarm	7.2	9.0	8.1	9.0
Urban	8.0	9.3	7.8	8.3
14-19 years	44.1	58.0	48.1	58.0
20-24 years	3.2	7.0	2.8	4.2
Middle Atlantic division	8.4	9.2	7.7	8.4
East North Central division	8.2	9.2	8.3	8.7
West North Central division	8.0	8.9	7.8	9.0
South Atlantic division	7.2	9.1	8.7	9.1
East South Central division	7.4	9.2	8.3	9.3
West South Central division	8.6	10.0	9.2	9.8

Source: *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940*, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 4, and Series P-4a, Nos. 11-16.

were 3 and 7 per cent, respectively, for males and 3 and 4 per cent, respectively, for females, indicate a greater difference proportionally.

The following data from the urban sample of the National Health Survey for 1935-36 tell much the same story:

Color	Per cent of persons in school			
	Male		Female	
	16-64 years	16-24 years	16-64 years	16-24 years
Colored	5.2	24.5	4.5	18.7
White	7.3	31.8	5.7	23.4

Source: Bernard D. Karpinos, *The Socio-Economic and Employment Status of the Urban Youth in the United States, 1935-36*, Federal Security Agency, U.S. Public Health Service, Washington, 1941, Tables 3 and 21.

Although a detailed evaluation of the data has not been attempted, the fact that two independent series have given virtually the same results indicates that the race differential in the proportion of students in the two groups really is smaller than might be expected as a result of the differences in general economic status and the availability of educational institutions.

A third group, persons who declared themselves unable to work, was larger proportionately at every age for colored than white persons (Table 13). Half of the colored females, 65 years of age and

Table 13. - Proportion of All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over Unable to Work, by Age, Residence, Geographic Division, Sex, and Color, 1940

Age, residence, and geographic division	Per cent unable to work			
	Male		Female	
	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White
United States total	5.8	5.8	7.0	4.2
14-19 years	1.1	0.8	1.4	0.8
20-24 years	1.5	1.1	1.9	1.1
25-44 years	2.3	1.5	3.0	0.9
45-64 years	7.1	5.7	10.2	3.4
65 years and over	43.1	39.3	50.5	29.4
Rural-farm				
14 years and over	3.8	5.1	4.9	4.0
65 years and over	29.0	32.9	44.4	30.6
Rural-nonfarm				
14 years and over	7.1	7.2	6.7	4.4
65 years and over	51.1	46.2	49.2	29.1
Urban				
14 years and over	6.6	5.6	8.2	4.3
65 years and over	52.9	39.4	55.1	29.1
Middle Atlantic division	5.9	5.5	7.9	4.0
East North Central division	7.2	5.9	9.3	4.2
West North Central division	7.6	6.3	8.4	4.3
South Atlantic division	5.4	5.3	6.5	4.3
East South Central division	5.3	6.0	6.4	4.6
West South Central division	6.3	5.9	7.0	4.3

Source: Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 4, and Series P-4a, Nos. 11-16.

over, as compared with less than one-third of the white women of the same age were incapacitated. This difference is fairly consistent with what is generally known about health conditions in the two racial groups. It is more questionable, however, whether, as the census data seem to indicate, the disability rates for colored persons are lower in farm areas than in urban areas or the male rate in farm areas really is lower in the colored than the white group. It seems more probable that these differences are due to the fact that aged Negroes in farm areas more often are forced to work or at least to look for work than are aged whites, whereas care of aged and disabled persons, both white and Negro, is more likely to be provided in urban than rural areas.

Finally, there is a significant race differential in regard to the proportion of males in penitentiaries, hospitals for the mentally diseased, and other institutions (Table 14).

Table 14. - Proportion of All Males 14 Years of Age and Over in Institutions, ^{a/} by Geographic Division and Color, 1940

Division	Per cent of all males 14 years of age and over in institutions				
	Nonwhite	White	Division	Nonwhite	White
United States total	2.7	1.5	South Atlantic	2.9	1.3
Middle Atlantic	3.9	1.6	East South Central	1.9	1.2
East North Central.....	4.2	1.5	West South Central	1.7	1.0
West North Central.....	4.2	1.4			

^{a/} Penal institutions, hospitals for the mentally diseased or defective, and homes for the aged, infirm, and needy.

Source: Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 4, and P-4a, Nos. 11-16.

THE UNEMPLOYED

The data on the relative size of the labor force constitute a useful, although by no means exact, index of the extent to which various population groups, living under different economic and social conditions, are willing and able to participate in the productive efforts of the nation. It has been pointed out already that the high proportions of Negro women, boys, and old men in the labor force probably are a consequence of the low earning power of the individual Negro worker. The slight trend in the direction of reduction of the racial differential, by the same token, probably indicates a certain relative improvement in the economic position of the Negro which has been largely brought about by more adequate social-welfare provisions. This, however, is hardly the sole explanation. Whether a person offers his services on the labor market or not may depend not only on his economic situation and personal inclinations but also to some extent on available employment opportunities. The spectacular decline in the proportion of aged Negroes who are in the labor force may in part be a consequence of the fact that many older workers lost their jobs during the depression and have been discouraged ever since from attempting to re-enter the labor market.

The earliest nationwide data on unemployment by color are contained in the 1930 census (Appendix table 12). The percentages probably are somewhat too low, partly because they do not include workers who had never had any gainful occupation, but they do not reveal a higher general incidence of unemployment among Negroes than whites. The proportion of male gainful workers which was registered as unemployed was 6 per cent for Negroes and 7 per cent for whites. The female rate was about 5 per cent for both racial groups. This, however, was largely due to the fact that Negroes were more concentrated than whites in rural areas and in the South,

where the incidence of unemployment generally was lower than elsewhere in the United States. That the urban Negro usually was harder hit by unemployment than the urban white worker is supported by census data for nineteen large cities for January, 1931 (Appendix table 12). In every city in the group which had a large Negro population at least 25 per cent of both the male and female Negro gainful workers were unemployed. In Detroit 60 per cent of the male and 75 per cent of the female Negro workers were jobless or on temporary layoffs. In most cities the proportions of white workers unemployed were substantially lower than those of Negro workers.

Later studies, which are based on more adequate definitions of labor force and unemployment, give more complete evidence of the fact that Negro workers in urban areas suffer from unemployment more often than white workers. According to the National Health Survey for 1935-36 (Appendix table 10), 36 per cent of the colored males and 28 per cent of the colored females in the urban labor force were seeking work or were on emergency work. The corresponding figures for the white urban labor force were 21 and 19 per cent, respectively. Data from the 1937 Unemployment Census (Table 15)

Table 15. - Persons Totally Unemployed or on Public Emergency Work as Per Cent of the Labor Force (15-74 years of age), ^a/ by Section, Size of Community, Age, Sex, and Color, November, 1937

Section, size of community, and age	Persons totally unemployed or on public emergency work as per cent of the labor force			
	Male		Female	
	Colored	White	Colored	White
United States total	26.0	17.7	33.3	23.9
The North	38.9	18.1	42.9	23.2
The South	18.0	16.0	26.0	26.2
The West	22.2	16.7	31.8	23.7
Urban				
1,000,000 population or more	37.2	20.4	39.8	24.7
350,000 to 1,000,000 population	38.5	18.2	46.9	21.4
25,000 to 350,000 population	31.8	18.3	35.8	24.5
10,000 to 25,000 population	24.3	16.4	19.1	20.0
Less than 10,000 population	22.4	15.8	24.9	21.5
Rural	12.6	16.6	19.6	28.6
15-19 years	35.7	41.2	46.0	42.9
20-24 years	28.6	24.1	36.4	23.2
25-34 years	24.2	14.1	32.5	18.1
35-44 years	25.1	12.9	31.5	21.4
45-54 years	25.0	15.3	29.9	22.8
55-64 years	24.4	19.2	27.4	24.3
65-74 years	21.2	20.1	24.2	20.5

^a/ Includes the fully employed, part-time workers, emergency workers, partly unemployed, and totally unemployed.

Source: Calvert L. Dedrick and Morris H. Hansen, Final Report on Total and Partial Unemployment, 1937, Vol. IV, The Enumerative Check Census, Census of Partial Employment, Unemployment, and Occupations, Washington, 1938, pp. 38-39, 71-73, and 103-105.

indicate that in the whole country 26 per cent of the colored males as compared with 18 per cent of the white males in the labor force were totally unemployed or on emergency work in November, 1937. The figures for females in the labor force were even higher or 33 and 24 per cent, respectively. The race differential was particularly pronounced in the North and in large cities, whereas there was little or no difference in the South and in small urban centers. In rural areas unemployment rates were actually lower for the colored than the white labor force. Thus, in spite of the fact that the general southern figures fail to reveal any significant race differential, it appears probable that the urban South had a higher unemployment ratio for colored than white workers.

The 1940 data (Appendix table 13) reveal a much lower general level of unemployment, partly because of real changes in the employment situation which had occurred since 1937 but probably also for other reasons.⁷ Furthermore, a somewhat lower proportion of females than males was without jobs and the race differential was less pronounced for males than in the 1937 figures. In other respects, however, the data tend to substantiate the differences between the two racial groups already observed. The general unemployment rate for males was 18 per cent for colored and 14 per cent for white workers, and the figures for females were 15 and 13 per cent, respectively. The race differential for females appears to be relatively more pronounced when the number of unemployed is expressed as a percentage of all women 14 years of age or over, including the non-workers (6 and 3 per cent, respectively). The colored rates varied more with residence than the white rates. They were lower than the white rates in rural-farm areas, about the same as the white rates in rural-nonfarm areas, and much higher than those for white workers in cities. The racial differences were more pronounced in the North than in the South, which, however, is due at least in part to the fact that the colored population in the North is almost entirely urban while in the South it is both rural and urban. The proportion of unemployed workers in the colored male labor force was as high as 39 per cent in Philadelphia, and the corresponding figures for Chicago, Detroit, and New York were 35, 33, and 30 per cent, respectively (Appendix table 13), whereas the proportions for white male workers in these four northern cities varied between 12 and 18 per

⁷ The census for November, 1937, indicates a total amount of unemployment of about 11,000,000. This was higher than any of the current estimates of unemployment, which, with various adjustments for certain other factors, were made on the basis of the 1930 census and indexes of employment. The highest of these estimates (Alexander Hamilton Institute) gave a figure of over 10,000,000 for November, 1937, and the lowest (Robert Nathan) a figure of over 7,000,000.

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Table 16. - Incidence of Unemployment among Persons in the Labor Force 14 Years of Age and Over, by Sex, Age, Residence, and Color, March 24-30, 1940

Sex and age	Persons seeking work or on public emergency work as per cent of the labor force							
	Total		Rural-farm		Rural-nonfarm		Urban	
	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White
Male								
14 years and over	17.6	14.2	4.2	8.3	20.1	18.3	26.3	15.0
14-19 years.....	22.1	32.5	5.2	15.6	29.9	41.4	45.2	41.1
20-24 years.....	20.0	19.8	5.5	13.1	22.2	23.6	32.3	21.1
25-44 years.....	16.5	11.3	4.2	8.1	17.1	14.4	22.5	11.3
45-64 years.....	18.0	13.2	3.2	5.7	21.3	18.2	26.9	14.5
65 years and over	11.1	9.7	2.0	2.0	19.1	15.1	23.7	13.4
Female								
14 years and over	14.5	13.0	4.6	13.4	11.3	13.9	18.1	12.7
14-19 years.....	22.1	32.5	5.7	15.6	23.1	34.7	38.8	34.2
20-24 years.....	17.8	14.5	7.0	16.8	13.3	15.0	22.4	14.2
25-44 years.....	12.8	8.4	3.9	9.0	8.8	8.5	15.3	8.3
45-64 years.....	12.0	11.3	3.1	6.8	10.2	13.5	15.3	11.3
65 years and over	7.6	7.0	2.9	2.3	7.5	6.7	11.0	8.1

Source: Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 4.

cent. It should be emphasized that all figures cited include emergency workers. In spite of the fact that quite a number of workers on work projects were enumerated under other headings, the census data reveal large numbers of such workers, particularly in the colored male labor force (7 per cent). The corresponding figure for the white male labor force was somewhat lower (5 per cent), and the female rate (3 per cent for both racial groups) was even less. These general averages, however, conceal significant differences among the various regions and residence groups. The proportions of the colored labor force enumerated as emergency workers in the North and in urban areas were much higher than the corresponding proportions of white workers, whereas the reverse was found in rural areas and in many parts of the South.⁸

Both the 1937 and the 1940 census data, unlike the 1930 census data, indicate a higher general incidence of unemployment among colored than white workers in spite of the fact that Negroes are more concentrated than whites in rural areas, where total unemployment, according to all studies, is not only comparatively low but even lower for Negroes than whites.⁹ If the rate of urbanization continues to be higher for Negroes than whites, the general race differential in unemployment ratios, other circumstances being equal, will tend to become still more pronounced. There are no available data, however, to indicate whether there really is a trend toward an increase in the general race differential, for no two nationwide studies on unemployment among whites and Negroes are entirely comparable.¹⁰

⁸ For further discussion of the differences in the proportions of Negroes and whites on WPA, CCC, and NYA, see pp. 239, 258, and 261.

⁹ Studies of unemployment in farm areas raise more difficult problems of technique and definition than do studies of urban unemployment, and the results, therefore, are generally considered less reliable. It should be noted, however, that two independent studies give similar results in regard to all questions of major significance for this analysis.

¹⁰ Local studies throw some light on the problem. The following data from the annual school censuses for Cincinnati, Ohio, are rather suggestive in this connection:

Color	Unemployed persons as per cent of all employable						
	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
Colored.....	54.3	53.4	51.0	49.5	36.0	52.7	45.3
White.....	28.0	21.2	17.8	17.5	8.0	16.4	12.8

Source: "Unemployment in Cincinnati, 1939," *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 49, October, 1939, p. 837. The colored unemployment rates in Cincinnati remained high during the entire

Unemployment ratios vary significantly with age in the two population groups (Appendix table 10 and Tables 15 and 16). Youth is always harder hit than middle-aged and old workers. Colored urban youth are even worse off than white urban youth. Of all colored male workers 14-19 years of age in 1940, 46 per cent were unemployed, whereas the corresponding proportion for white youth was 41 per cent. The situation improved more with advancing age for white than colored workers. In the case of male urban workers 25-44 years of age, the colored and white unemployment rates were 23 and 11 per cent, respectively. The older age groups had only slightly higher proportions unemployed, and the race differentials remained about the same. The data for females reveal somewhat similar variations with age. The Health Survey data for urban male and female workers in 1935-36 (Appendix table 10) and the information from the 1937 Unemployment Census (Table 15) substantiate the conclusion that the Negro-white difference in unemployment risk is mainly a problem of the Negro's inability to improve his chances on the labor market with increased age and experience to the same extent as the white worker.

If age and experience help the Negro worker less than the white worker, how about education? Data from the National Health Survey (Table 17) indicate that the unemployment risk for white urban

Table 17. - Per Cent of Workers, 16-25 Years of Age, in the Urban Labor Force with Specified Scholastic Achievement Who Are Unemployed, by Color and Sex, 1935-36

Sex and color	All workers	Workers by grade achieved					
		Less than 6th grade	6th grade	7th grade	8th grade	High school	College
Male							
Colored	47.3	46.0	46.7	50.0	55.7	47.2	29.4
White	36.2	55.5	53.7	50.0	46.3	34.7	18.2
Female							
Colored	38.0	35.6	31.8	38.3	41.9	40.2	32.2
White	29.6	42.7	36.2	38.9	32.5	31.1	17.7

Sources: Bernard D. Karpinos, *The Socio-Economic and Employment Status of the Urban Youth of the United States, 1935-1936*, Federal Security Agency, U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, 1941. Tables 13 and 26.

workers, 16-24 years old, declines progressively with increased scholastic achievements. About 56 per cent of the male white workers with less than a sixth-grade education were unemployed in 1935-36,

period 1933-39 and were subject to proportionately smaller changes than the white rates. On the other hand, the relative gain in the proportion of employed persons was about the same for colored (45 to 55 per cent) as for white (72 to 87 per cent) workers.

whereas only 18 per cent of those with a college education were jobless. Among urban Negro youth, on the other hand, there was no consistent trend of this kind at all except that persons with college training were somewhat better off than those with less education. Colored urban youth whose education extended no higher than the sixth grade were somewhat better off than white youth with a similar lack of formal training. The colored and white youth who had completed the seventh grade had the same amount of unemployment (50 per cent for males and 38-39 per cent for females). It was only because such a large proportion of white youth had gone farther than the seventh grade that their general position was better than that of colored youth.

THE EMPLOYED

Because of the great amount of unemployment among Negroes, only 59 per cent of all colored males, 14 years of age and over, in urban areas were registered as employed in 1940 (Table 18). The

Table 18. - Employed Persons (except on Public Emergency Work) as Per Cent of All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over, by Residence and in Selected Large Cities, by Sex and Color, 1940

Residence and city	Employed persons as per cent of all persons 14 years of age and over			
	Male		Female	
	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White
United States total	65.8	67.8	32.1	21.1
Rural-farm	79.7	74.0	23.3	9.3
Rural-nonfarm	59.1	61.4	29.4	16.8
Urban	58.9	67.7	37.8	26.0
New York	56.8	66.7	38.6	27.4
Chicago	50.6	70.7	23.4	29.6
Philadelphia	47.9	66.7	30.0	26.7
Detroit	57.5	74.3	21.3	24.1

Source: Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, Nos. 4 and 6.

corresponding proportion for white urban males was much higher or 68 per cent. The 1937 Unemployment Census shows an even greater race differential in this respect in that but 42-46 per cent of the colored males in urban places with 25,000 population or more and 52-53 per cent of those in smaller cities were designated as fully employed, while the corresponding figures for white males were 60-63 per cent and 61-62 per cent, respectively (Appendix table 14). Colored females in urban areas, on the other hand, usually were utilized as workers to a greater extent (38 per cent in 1940) than white females (27 per cent). This, of course, is due to the fact that much greater proportions of colored than white females offer their

services on the labor market. There were important exceptions, however. The proportion of actual workers in the female population was larger in the white than the colored group in two of the four large northern cities for which data are given in Table 18, and there were similar exceptions in 1937 (Appendix table 14).

The conditions were quite different in farm areas. Both the male and female colored population in rural areas were utilized for productive work to a greater extent than the white population. This rural-urban differential indicates that Negroes are far from being fully absorbed by the nonagricultural economy into which they are moving with such rapidity.

Chapter IV

FAMILY COMPOSITION

The urban family has, in the main, ceased to be a production unit. In rural areas the family is still frequently a production unit, but even there it is losing its importance in that respect. For consumption purposes, however, the family is the main entity. For that reason it is pertinent in a study of living conditions to consider the family composition of the population. This is the more obvious in view of the fact that the needs of the family vary in relation to its size and composition. Income also varies, particularly with the number of adults in the family, but it is not likely to vary as widely according to the number of minor children. Therefore, the frequency of families with several small children is highly significant. So far as their number is concerned, such families are declining in relative importance in the United States; but they are rearing a much larger proportion of the coming generation than their actual numbers indicate. Hence their living conditions are of great concern in terms of the quality and health of the future working population.

Also important from the point of view of consumption is the efficiency with which families organize themselves as consumption units. Unattached individuals ordinarily cannot organize their consumption as economically as can family groups. Broken families are more likely than normal families to have difficulties in organizing themselves as effective consumption units because they have smaller incomes on the average and because the same person is likely to have to serve both as breadwinner and as homemaker.

The Bureau of the Census gathers by far the most extensive data on families in the United States. It was not until 1930, however, that anything but a simple count of families was made on the basis of this material, so that the analysis of census data on family composition is confined chiefly to 1930. Few data on family composition are yet available from the 1940 census. It is unlikely, however, that race differentials changed markedly between 1930 and 1940

so that general conclusions based on the earlier data still have validity.¹

FAMILY SIZE

Data on average family size do not reveal any significant differences between Negroes and whites. The mean number of members per private family,² according to the 1930 census, was 3.8 persons for the total population of the United States. The corresponding figure for the Negro population was exactly the same, while it was slightly lower for families with native white heads (3.7) and higher for households with foreign-born heads (4.1). In the main, however, it was because Negroes were more concentrated than whites in the rural-farm areas of the South, where both Negro and white families (4.7) are larger than in most other regions (Table 19),

Table 19. - Average \bar{x} Size of Family, by Section, Residence, Age of Members, and Color, 1930

Section and residence	Average number of persons per family							
	Total		Under 10 years of age		10-20 years of age		21 years of age and over	
	Negro	Native white	Negro	Native white	Negro	Native white	Negro	Native white
United States total.	3.81	3.73	0.90	0.79	0.84	0.71	2.07	2.23
The North								
Urban.	3.31	3.47	0.65	0.65	0.53	0.57	2.13	2.25
The South								
Urban.	3.29	3.70	0.64	0.73	0.63	0.69	2.02	2.28
Rural-nonfarm.	3.59	4.04	0.68	1.05	0.74	0.81	1.97	2.18
Rural-farm.	4.66	4.72	1.28	1.22	1.24	1.20	2.14	2.30

\bar{x} / Mean.

Source: Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. VI, pp. 19 and 21 and State tables 9 and 10.

that the national average for Negro families happened to be as high as for all families combined. Negro families in the urban North, as

¹ The Consumer Purchases Study (see p. 90 and Appendix B) and the National Health Survey (p. 59) for 1935-36 contain useful information on family composition. Up to the time of this writing, however, no such tabulations by race had been published from the National Health Survey. Certain results from the Consumer Purchases Study have been utilized in the subsequent chapters on income and consumption.

² In the 1930 census a family is defined "as a group of persons, related either by blood or by marriage or adoption, who live together as one household, usually sharing the same table. Single persons living alone are counted as families, however, as are a few small groups of unrelated persons sharing the same living accommodations as 'partners.' Households reporting more than 10 lodgers are classified as boarding or lodging houses rather than as families" (*Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930*, Population Vol. VI, pp. 5-6 and 7). It should be noted that servants living with their employers as well as lodgers are not counted as members of the main families in the residential household.

well as in the urban and rural nonfarm areas of the South, on the other hand, were actually somewhat smaller than native white families in the same areas. Differences between various regional and residential groups were, on the whole, much larger than those between racial groups.⁸

A closer inspection of the census data reveals, however, that there were significant differences in family structure between Negroes and whites. Whenever the average size of the Negro family was smaller than that of white families, it was mainly a matter of a smaller number of adult members per family, whereas the average number of children of dependent ages in most comparable cases was about as high for Negroes as for whites (Table 19). Of still greater interest is the fact that the Negro population, on the one hand, included a greater proportion of "nonfamily" persons and very small families and, on the other hand, a greater proportion of large families than did the white population. Unattached individuals and so-called "one-person families" constituted about 13 per cent of the Negro population, whereas the corresponding figure for the white population was 9 per cent. Families of two persons also were more frequent among Negroes than among native whites, just as families of seven or more persons were relatively more numerous in the case of Negroes (Appendix table 16).

The distribution by number of children in the family shows a similar pattern in that the proportion of families without children, in comparable groups of localities, was higher among Negroes than among native whites. At the same time Negroes had a greater proportion of families with four or more children than did the native white population (Appendix table 17). Not less than 59 per cent of all Negro children under 21 years of age in private families belonged to households which had at least four such children, whereas the corresponding proportion for native white families was 44 per cent. These findings substantiate the previous statement that living conditions in large families are much more significant, particularly from a dynamic point of view, than is indicated by the numbers of such families. It should furthermore be considered that large fami-

⁸ Earlier census data on population per family, including lodgers, servants, members of quasi-family groups, etc. (see Appendix table 15), seem to indicate that the absence of any significant race differentials in regard to average size of household is a rather old phenomenon. The size of the residential household, by and large, has been declining to about the same extent in the Negro and the white group. There was no such decline, however, in the case of Negro households in the North during the period 1910 to 1930. This exception may be due to an increase in the number of lodgers, brought about by the northbound migration of Negroes during this period.

Table 20. - Type of Families, by Section, Residence, and Color, 1930

Type of families	United States		Urban North				South			
	Total	a/ Negro	Native white	Negro	Native white	Urban	Rural	Nonfarm	Negro	Native white
Total families:										
Number of	2,801,000		20,956,000	514,000	7,681,000	784,000	2,193,000	1,529,000	962,000	2,334,000
Per cent--	100.0		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Normal families:	70.4		80.5	70.5	79.2	61.6	80.2	83.2	79.9	87.2
Broken families d/	29.6		19.5	29.5	20.8	38.4	19.8	16.8	20.1	12.8
Men head	10.3		7.6	10.0	6.3	9.5	5.2	6.3	9.5	7.4
Woman head	19.3		11.9	19.5	14.5	28.9	14.6	10.5	10.6	5.4

a/ Includes families in rural North and in urban and rural West.

b/ Exclusive of New England.

c/ Exclusive of families for which marital status of head was unknown.

d/ Includes married if spouse not present, widowed, divorced, and single heads of families.

Source: Unpublished tabulations, U. S. Bureau of the Census.

lies are much more likely than small ones to live in rural-farm areas where the level of living tends to be particularly low. Thus the proportion of all Negro families that resided in the rural-farm areas of the South increased quite regularly with the size of the family from 17 per cent for one-person families up to 66 per cent for families of ten persons or more.⁴

The great frequency of small families in the Negro group was, in part, due to the fact that the proportion of broken families was as high as 30 per cent as compared to 20 per cent among native whites (Table 20). This is not the whole explanation, however, for in the case of both normal and broken families one recognizes the usual pattern of a comparatively great relative number of small as well as large household units in the Negro group (Table 21). For example, more than one-fifth of all broken Negro families with a woman head—as against one-tenth in the case of corresponding native white families—had three or more children under 21 years of age (Table 22). The same proportion for Negro rural-farm families with a woman head was as high as two-fifths. It goes without saying that such large broken families in many instances have to face extreme economic difficulties. Taking all whites (native and foreign-born) and Negroes together, there were 38,000 families in 1930 headed by a woman that contained four or more children under 10 years of age. Of these families 15,500 or 41 per cent were Negro.

The relation between the number of children and the age of the family head is rather different in the Negro and the native white group (Appendix table 18). In the case of normal families where the head was under 25 years of age, there was roughly the same proportion of households without any children under 21 years of age in both racial groups, but there were relatively more Negro than native white families which had several children. For each higher age of the family head, up to the 35 to 44 year group, there was a lower relative number of households without children and a higher number of families with several children for each racial group. Such a trend, of course, was to be expected. The peculiar thing, however, is that it was much more pronounced for native white families than it was for Negroes, so that the relative number of normal family heads 35 to 44 years of age who did not have any children under 21 was about twice as high among Negroes as among native whites. This must be largely due to race differentials in regard to fertility, inci-

⁴ *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. VI, pp. 13-15 and State table 5.*

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Table 21. - Per Cent Distribution of Normal and Broken Families, by Size and Color, 1930 a/

Family type and color	Total number of families	Per cent of families with specified number of members								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
Negro										
Normal	1,972,000	-	29.4	19.8	14.5	10.7	8.0	6.0	4.3	7.3
Broken	828,000	40.7	19.3	13.4	9.2	6.4	4.3	2.8	1.7	2.2
Man head	289,000	57.4	14.2	9.1	6.4	4.5	3.1	2.1	1.4	1.8
Woman head	540,000	31.7	22.1	15.6	10.8	7.4	4.9	3.2	1.9	2.4
Native white										
Normal	16,870,000	-	23.9	23.4	20.1	13.4	8.2	4.9	2.9	3.2
Broken	4,083,000	37.5	25.2	16.1	9.5	5.5	3.1	1.6	0.8	0.7
Man head	1,596,000	43.8	22.8	14.2	8.5	4.9	2.8	1.5	0.8	0.7
Woman head	2,487,000	33.4	26.8	17.2	10.2	5.9	3.2	1.7	0.9	0.7

a/ Exclusive of families for which marital status of head was unknown.

Source: Unpublished tabulations, U. S. Bureau of the Census.

Table 22. - Per Cent Distribution of Normal Families and of Broken Families with Women Heads by Number of Children under 21 Years of Age, by Section, Residence, and Color, 1930 ^{a/}

Family type and number of children under 21 years of age	United States total				Urban North ^{b/}				South			
	Native		Negro		Native		Negro		Urban		Rural-nonfarm	
	Negro	white	Negro	white	Negro	white	Negro	white	Negro	white	Negro	white
Total number of normal families	1,972,000	16,870,000	362,000	6,086,000	483,000	1,760,000	293,000	1,273,000	768,000	2,036,000		
Per cent with												
No children	35.5	32.1	46.4	36.4	43.0	31.9	35.7	25.1	25.0	20.8		
1 child	19.7	23.5	20.2	25.7	21.5	25.7	21.0	22.5	17.6	18.5		
2 children	13.6	18.6	12.8	19.0	13.2	19.6	14.0	19.4	14.1	17.1		
3 children	9.7	11.2	8.3	9.8	8.6	11.1	9.9	13.4	11.2	13.9		
4 children or more	21.5	14.6	12.3	9.1	13.7	11.7	19.4	19.6	31.9	29.7		
Total number of broken families with women head	540,000	2,487,000	52,000	569,000	115,000	179,000	41,000	81,000	26,000	48,000		
Per cent with												
No children	46.0	63.5	57.6	67.9	50.5	56.1	42.5	50.1	25.2	38.1		
1-2 children	33.1	26.1	30.2	24.6	34.0	32.2	34.4	31.6	34.0	32.8		
3 children or more	20.9	10.4	12.2	7.5	15.5	11.7	23.1	18.3	40.8	29.1		

^{a/} Exclusive of families for which marital status of head was unknown.

^{b/} Exclusive of New England.

Sources: Unpublished tabulations, U. S. Bureau of the Census.

dence of sterility, and the like.⁵ The further development, however, is just as interesting. While for both racial groups there was a decrease in the number of children per family with further increases in age of family head, this change, too, was much more marked for whites than for Negroes. This presumably is not due to differences in fertility patterns so much as to the well-known habit in the Negro population of letting grandparents take care of one's children. It is also possible that three-generation families were more prevalent in the Negro than the white group.

LODGERS

As already indicated, residential households include two types of persons besides members of the family; namely, resident servants and lodgers. The first group is insignificant in Negro families.⁶ Lodgers, on the other hand, are of considerable importance. The presence of lodgers in the family home is undesirable, by and large, both because it may contribute to overcrowding and also because it may constitute a disruptive factor in family life and even may seriously endanger the mental and moral well-being of the home.

The problem of lodgers is primarily an urban one. Among Negroes and southern whites there is a direct relationship between the size of community and the proportion of families with lodgers. In northern urban areas 29 per cent of the Negro families as against 10 per cent of the native white families reported lodgers in the home in 1930. In southern urban areas the proportions were about 20 per cent and 11 per cent, respectively (Table 23).

The larger proportion of urban Negro families with lodgers in the North than in the South reflects the concentration of Negroes in large northern cities where the population is most mobile and hence the opportunities for renting out rooms are greatest. Also, it generally takes some time before recent migrants to cities become organized as families and begin to create a demand for independent family dwelling units. It is quite probable that the very rapidity of the Negro cityward migration aggravated the shortage of family dwelling units in the segregated Negro sections of northern cities

⁵ See the forthcoming monograph on Negro population in this series by Samuel A. Stouffer, Lyonel C. Florant, Harold Dorn, and Dudley Kirk.

⁶ According to the 1930 census only 0.3 per cent of the Negro families had resident servants as against 2.1 per cent of the native white families. These figures are somewhat low, since they do not include families with both lodgers and resident servants. See U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Negroes in the United States, 1920-1932*, p. 259.

Table 23.—Per Cent of Negro and Native White Families with Lodgers, by Section, Residence, and Color, 1930

Section and residence	Per cent of families with lodgers	
	Negro	Native white
United States total—	15.2	9.0
The North		
Urban	26.9	10.1
The South		
Urban	19.8	11.3
Rural-nonfarm . .	11.5	6.4
Rural-farm	5.7	5.3

Source: Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930.
Population Vol. VI, pp. 24-25 and State table 12.

and thus forced many families and individuals who preferred independent apartments to live as lodgers.

The fact that broken families are relatively more numerous among Negroes than among whites also contributes to the greater proportion of families with lodgers in the Negro group, for broken families are more often forced by economic necessity to increase their incomes by taking roomers. Not less than one-third of the urban Negro families with a woman head, as compared to one-fifth of the corresponding native white families, had lodgers in 1930 (Appendix table 19). But among normal families, too, the Negroes had more lodgers proportionally than whites (19 and 8 per cent, respectively).

The data on the number of lodgers in families with different numbers of children are highly significant. Among both whites and Negroes, the more children in the family, the less likely the family is to have lodgers. Nevertheless, quite a substantial proportion of the large families have lodgers. Among normal families with four or more children under 21 years of age, for example, about 6 per cent of the white families and over 10 per cent of the Negro families reported lodgers in their homes. The corresponding figure for Negro broken families with a woman head and three or more children under 21 years of age was as high as 20 per cent; and between 3 and 4 per cent of the Negro families with women heads had both three or more children and three or more lodgers.

WORKERS IN NEGRO AND NATIVE WHITE FAMILIES

The number of gainful workers in a family, as defined by the census, and the number of earners per family are both important criteria of the economic stability of the family. The two are not

Table 24. - Number of Gainful Workers per Family, by Section, Residence, and Color, 1930

Section and residence	Negro					Native white				
	Number of families	Per cent of families with speci- fied number of gainful workers				Number of families	Per cent of families with specified number of gainful workers			
		0	1	2	3 or more		0	1	2	3 or more
United States total	2,804,000	3.1	54.7	27.0	15.2	20,969,000	6.3	65.2	20.0	8.5
The North										
Urban	514,000	3.9	56.3	28.4	11.4	7,685,000	6.3	63.4	21.3	9.0
The South										
Urban	785,000	3.8	49.9	32.4	13.9	2,195,000	6.0	62.4	21.8	9.8
Rural-nonfarm	446,000	5.1	60.7	23.5	10.7	1,530,000	7.7	68.4	17.2	6.7
Rural-farm	962,000	0.6	53.9	24.2	21.1	2,335,000	1.6	65.2	20.5	12.7

Source: Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. VI, p. 8 and State table 11.

synonymous, however, as many so-called gainful workers were unemployed at the time the 1930 census was taken and some gainfully occupied persons in rural areas were nothing but unpaid family workers on their home farms.

The proportion of families with no gainful workers was lower among Negroes than whites (Table 24). Likewise, the relative number of multiple-worker families was considerably higher among Negroes, reflecting the great pressure on Negroes to have as many members as possible contribute to the family income since, in general, the earnings of any one member are low.⁷ There are few normal families which do not have any gainful workers; and this is particularly true with regard to Negroes. The proportion of broken families which does not include any workers is only one-third to one-half as large among Negroes as among native whites. Among Negro urban families with women heads, for example, 12 per cent had no gainfully occupied members in 1930, whereas the corresponding figure for white families was 38 per cent.⁸

At the same time that the broken families included a comparatively large number of households which had no gainfully occupied members, they also included substantial proportions of families with more than one worker. As a matter of fact, the relative number of families with three or more workers was even greater in some instances among households with women heads than among normal families, and in no case was it substantially smaller. This was true in spite of the fact that broken families are smaller than normal families, on the average.

The general rule is that the relation between number of workers per family and size of family is much more pronounced among Negroes than among whites (Table 25). It is furthermore particularly pronounced among southern Negroes, whereas there is no significant North-South differential in the case of native white families. This may constitute another indication of the extreme poverty of southern Negroes. Finally there is, both among Negroes and among whites, a closer relation between number of workers and family size in the case of broken families than in the case of normal households. Not less than one-third of the urban Negro families with a woman head and with three or more children under 21 years of age had at least three gainful workers; the corresponding proportion for native white families was one-fourth.

In summary, there are a number of factors in the family structure

⁷ See also p. 29.

⁸ Unpublished tabulations, U. S. Bureau of the Census.

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Table 25. - Number of Children under 21 Years of Age in Families with 3 Gainful Workers or More, by Family Type, Section, Residence, and Color, 1930

Family type, section, and residence	Negro				Native white			
	Per cent of families with specified number of children under 21				Per cent of families with specified number of children under 21			
	0	1	2	3 or more	0	1	2	3 or more
Normal families								
Urban North ^{a/}	7.0	13.9	18.6	19.7	5.5	7.9	8.9	15.5
Urban South	7.2	15.6	19.7	27.1	5.5	8.0	9.5	17.0
Total rural-nonfarm	3.5	8.8	12.5	20.6	3.2	5.3	6.0	10.5
Total rural-farm	3.9	12.5	20.1	34.0	4.2	7.0	8.8	15.9
Broken families with woman head								
Total urban	4.9	12.7	21.2	32.8	5.0	12.7	17.3	24.9
Total rural-nonfarm	3.2	9.3	17.6	30.7	2.1	7.0	10.2	14.9
Total rural-farm	5.4	15.0	32.0	47.9	6.1	17.5	25.0	31.4

^{a/} Excluding New England.

Sources: Unpublished tabulations, U. S. Bureau of the Census.

of the Negro population which must have a deteriorating influence on the economy of Negro households. First, the nonfamily population is larger in proportion than in the white group and broken families are more prevalent. On the other hand, a greater part of the family population consists of large families with several children of dependent age. There are more lodgers than in the white group and also more workers per family. The two last features may increase the income of the families, but at the same time they may make it more difficult to organize consumption and home life in a satisfactory manner.

Chapter V

FAMILY INCOMES

The best measure of the level of living of any group is provided by their pattern of consumption: what they actually eat, the kind of clothes they wear, and the houses they live in. Nevertheless, income data are useful in this connection since they afford an index of the potential planes of living of given groups. Information on incomes also makes it possible to ascertain whether or not deficiencies in the living of given groups, as judged by some standard, are largely attributable to income factors. In this connection the incomes of families rather than of single individuals are of primary interest since families constitute the great majority of consumer units.

GENERAL SOURCES OF DATA ON FAMILY INCOMES

Numerous studies of the incomes and expenditures of selected groups of families have been made at different times by both public and private research agencies. For the most part these studies have been limited to wage-earner families in a few communities, to farm families in selected counties, or to the population of a single community. The studies have thus been scattered and specialized in character, and in general they have been undertaken with a specific purpose in mind, making it difficult to generalize therefrom. Their usefulness is limited, moreover, by the fact that definitions and methods vary from one study to another and that in many cases the samples are small. The findings of the more reliable of these limited studies are utilized here, however, when they throw light on a particular problem.

The main body of information which is used in this chapter comes from the Consumer Purchases Study of 1935-36. Most of the supplementary data are from four major studies; namely, the National Health Survey of 1935-36, the Financial Survey of Urban Housing of 1934, the U. S. Department of Labor studies on money income and disbursements of families of employed wage earners and low-

salaried workers in larger cities in 1934-36, and the Works Progress Administration survey of landlords and tenants on cotton plantations in 1934.¹

INCOME, BY TYPE OF COMMUNITY

General estimates by the National Resources Committee, which were based mainly on the Consumer Purchases Study, indicate that the mean income of all families of two or more persons in the United States in 1935-36 was \$1,622, but more than two-thirds of all families had incomes below that figure. The median income—that is, the upper income limit for the lower half of all families—was \$1,160. About 14 per cent of the families had incomes of less than \$500.² For nonrelief families only the median income was \$1,285.

The National Resources Committee also made certain estimates for whites and Negroes separately but only for nonrelief families³ (Table 26). In the rural South the median income of white families

Table 25. — Estimated Average Income of Negro and White Nonrelief Families, by Region and Type of Community, 1935-36

Region and type of community	Average income per family			
	Median		Mean	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
Southern rural communities — — — — —	\$ 480	\$1,100	\$ 566	\$1,535
Southern cities of 2,500 population and over — —	525	1,570	635	2,019
North Central cities of 100,000 population and over (a) — — — —	1,095	1,720	1,227	2,616

a/ The Negro sample on which these estimates were based included only New York, Chicago, and Columbus, Ohio.

Sources: National Resources Committee, Consumer Incomes in the United States: Their Distribution in 1935-36, Washington, 1938, p. 28.

in 1935-36 was more than twice as high as that of Negro families, while in the urban South white incomes were three times as high, on the average, as Negro incomes. In the large North Central cities, on the other hand, the median income of white families was less than 60 per cent higher than that of Negro families.⁴ The North-South

¹ For a brief discussion of these studies, see Appendix A.

² National Resources Committee, *Consumer Incomes in the United States: Their Distribution in 1935-36*, Washington, 1938, pp. 4 and 18.

³ The estimates for Negro families are less reliable, however, than those for white families.

⁴ The mean figures show larger race differentials because they are influenced to a disproportionate degree by high incomes. Since the white population contains a larger proportion of well-to-do families than the Negro population, this is more significant for whites than for Negroes.

differential was pronounced in regard to Negroes, who averaged scarcely half as large incomes in the urban South as in the urban North. The differential was rather small or, allowing for the difference in community size, even nonexistent for the white urban population.

That Negroes are much better off in the North than in the South is a finding to be expected. On the other hand, the indications of relative equality in average income status between northern and southern whites in both rural and urban areas are surprising, as this seems to be entirely inconsistent with prevailing ideas concerning the greater poverty in the South. This apparent inconsistency can be explained by the fact that the proportion of Negroes in the southern population tends to be larger in the lower than the higher income classes so that whites are relatively underrepresented in the poorer population groups. Whites, therefore, have comparatively good chances of social advancement, which more or less offset the tendency of earnings in many jobs to be lower than they are in other parts of the country. These explanations refer only to median incomes and do not in any way challenge the general impression that those southern white families which can be characterized as poor are worse off than poverty-stricken households in most other parts of the country.

While the subsequent analysis in the main confirms the general impression given by Table 26, the race differentials were probably greater than the data in the table indicate. Several significant low-income groups were excluded from the southern rural sample of the Consumer Purchases Study,⁵ and it is likely that as a result the rural income figures are too high. This is of more importance for Negroes than whites. Also the urban income figures are less representative for Negroes than for whites, particularly in the North, owing to the large proportion of urban Negroes who were on relief and who, consequently, were excluded from the sample used for the income estimates.

These qualifications also apply, of course, to the original data from the Consumer Purchases Study. The fact that complete information on the income of relief families was not obtained makes it necessary to handle the relief group as an entity placing it below the lowest income group of nonrelief families, which certainly, on the average, had higher earnings. There are obviously many individual cases, however, in which relief families had larger incomes

⁵ See Appendix A.

than other families not on relief.⁶ Even more significant is the fact that the general representativeness of the real income data varies with the relief incidence.

Farm Families

Among normal families⁷ in southern rural-farm areas, the relief incidence in 1935-36 was consistently lower for Negroes than for whites (Table 27). At the same time nonrelief Negro families were relatively much more numerous than nonrelief white families in the lowest income brackets. Among Negro sharecroppers in Mississippi, for instance, nonrelief families with less than \$250 annual income outnumbered relief families four to one, but among white sharecroppers in the same state there was only one nonrelief family with an income below \$250 to every five relief families. Such data clearly reflect the much greater unmet need for relief among Negro than white farm families. More significant, however, is the indication that the low income status of all Negroes in rural areas only partly depends upon their low occupational level. Within a given socioeconomic group, their incomes tend to be much lower than those of whites, although the white farm population includes a high proportion of desperately poor people.

Over 65 per cent of the Negro sharecroppers sampled in Georgia counties either had nonrelief incomes of less than \$500 or were on relief, whereas the corresponding proportion for white sharecroppers was about 44 per cent. The proportions for Mississippi sharecroppers were 68 and 39 per cent, respectively. No sharecropper family, either Negro or white, had an income as high as \$2,000 in the survey year, and except in the North Carolina counties few reported incomes of as much as \$1,500. Yet the data tend to indicate a somewhat better situation than actually existed, since they

⁶ Even in a given community where a single relief policy prevailed many large relief families had higher aggregate incomes than some of the small nonrelief households. This was still more true in regard to groups of cities or of farm counties, since various communities often differed widely in regard to the stringency of the means tests which were applied. The data on income for rural nonrelief Negroes, for instance, must have included a great number of households which would have been on relief had they been living in a city, and this circumstance may have tended to exaggerate the difference in income between rural and urban Negroes. Moreover, in many places different means tests were applied to Negroes and to whites. In consequence, income data for nonrelief families are frequently not entirely comparable, and the relief incidence will have to be considered to understand their full significance.

⁷ A normal family was defined as a family containing both a husband and a wife, with or without other persons in the family.

Table 27. - Per Cent Distribution of Negro and White Families/ in Selected Communities, by Relief Status and Nonrelief Income, 1935-36 (continued)

Family type, community or county group, and color		Number of families in sample	On relief	Per cent of families										Median income of nonrelief families
				Less than \$250	\$250-\$499	\$500-\$749	\$750-\$999	\$1,000-\$1,499	\$1,500-\$1,999	\$2,000-\$2,999	\$3,000 or more			
NEGRO FAMILIES (Cont.)														
Urban														
South														
& small cities														
Negro	2,665	18.3	9.7	31.9	25.4	7.2	5.0	1.3	1.1	0.1	\$ 495			
White	4,958	11.2	0.6	3.3	10.0	11.9	21.8	16.2	14.8	10.2	1,415			
Columbia, S. C.														
Negro	2,294	19.9	4.0	20.6	28.5	13.4	8.5	3.0	1.9	0.2	635			
White	4,715	8.3	0.2	1.2	3.2	7.5	14.6	18.0	22.9	22.1	1,975			
Mobile, Ala.														
Negro	3,370	23.2	7.7	24.6	22.9	11.4	6.8	1.6	1.7	0.1	565			
White	5,364	9.5	0.8	3.9	7.0	12.1	20.2	17.3	17.5	11.7	1,535			
Atlanta, Ga.														
Negro	5,827	33.0	2.4	10.7	19.8	15.8	11.4	3.5	2.6	0.8	760			
White	14,323	13.4	0.4	1.8	5.1	6.8	15.7	17.7	22.5	16.6	1,880			
North														
Columbus, Ohio														
Negro	2,049	39.8	0.6	2.8	8.7	16.3	20.6	7.3	3.2	0.7	1,030			
White	16,446	12.0	0.4	1.4	3.6	7.5	20.8	19.8	20.8	13.5	1,750			
Native-born														
Foreign-born	190	14.7	1.6	3.7	6.3	12.1	24.2	17.4	13.2	6.8	1,380			
Chicago, Ill.														
Negro	831	40.7	0.7	3.5	6.5	12.3	19.6	9.6	5.8	1.3	1,130			
White	28,515	9.5	1.1	1.8	3.8	6.6	19.5	20.9	23.2	13.6	1,800			
Native-born														
Foreign-born	4,433	10.6	1.7	3.2	5.3	9.6	23.3	19.7	17.7	8.9	1,540			
New York, N. Y.														
Negro	1,262	43.7	0.2	0.6	2.3	8.9	21.9	13.2	6.7	2.5	1,350			
White	13,656	14.1	0.7	0.9	1.9	3.5	13.8	18.2	26.7	20.2	2,110			

Table 27. - Per Cent distribution of Negro and White Families^a in Selected Communities, by Relief Status and Nonrelief Income, 1935-36 (continued)

Family type, community or county group, and color	Number of families in sample	Per cent of families										Median b/ income of non- relief families
		On relief	Less than		With nonrelief income of						\$2,000- \$2,999	\$3,000- or more
			\$250- \$499	\$500- \$749	\$750- \$999	\$1,000- \$1,499	\$1,500- \$1,999	\$2,000- \$2,999				
BROKEN FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS												
South												
Columbia, S. C.												
Negro	127	18.1	36.2	24.4	13.4	4.0	3.1	0.8				\$ 300
White	93	19.3	2.1	3.2	16.2	3.2	14.0	18.3			8.5	15.2
Mobile, Ala.												
Negro	216	23.1	35.6	29.6	6.5	2.8	1.4	1.0				275
White	145	12.4	9.7	15.8	11.0	7.6	14.5	13.1			8.3	7.6
Atlanta, Ga.												
Negro	214	35.5	15.4	25.7	11.7	5.2	5.6	0.9				415
White	260	14.2	5.0	11.5	15.0	10.0	16.6	8.1			12.7	6.9
North												
Columbus, Ohio												
Negro	112	61.6	3.6	12.5	8.0	3.6	7.1	2.7			0.9	595
White	444	23.2	1.6	11.5	12.6	9.2	17.6	12.2			7.9	4.0
Chicago, Ill.												
Negro	400	57.0	3.8	9.5	10.5	7.7	8.5	1.5			1.5	695
White	986	14.2	5.2	5.2	8.3	9.5	19.6	15.0			13.9	9.1
ALL FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS												
South												
Columbia, S. C.												
Negro	2,421	19.2	17.1	22.2	22.3	9.5	6.3	2.1			1.1	0.2
White	4,808	11.0	0.6	1.7	7.8	6.5	14.5	18.1			19.4	20.4
Mobile, Ala.												
Negro	3,586	23.2	19.3	26.7	16.1	7.8	4.5	1.3			1.0	0.1
White	5,529	10.3	3.3	7.2	8.1	10.9	18.6	16.1			14.9	10.6
Atlanta, Ga.												
Negro	5,741	34.1	8.2	17.3	16.2	11.1	8.9	2.4			1.4	0.4
White	4,583	13.6	1.5	4.1	7.4	7.6	16.0	15.5			20.2	14.2

Table 27. - Per Cent Distribution of Negro and White Families^{a/} in Selected Communities, by Relief Status and nonrelief income, 1935-36 (continued)

Family type, community or community group, and color	Number of families in sample	Per cent of families										Median b/ income of non- relief families
		On relief	With nonrelief incomes of								\$3,000 or more	
			Less than \$250	\$250- \$499	\$500- \$749	\$750- \$999	\$1,000- \$1,499	\$1,500- \$1,999	\$2,000- \$2,999			
ALL FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS (cont.)												
North												
Columbus, Ohio												
Negro	2,161	46.4	1.5	5.7	8.5	12.5	16.5	5.9	2.5	0.5	\$ 975	
White	18,890	14.8	0.8	3.9	6.1	8.0	20.0	17.8	17.5	11.1	1,605	
Chicago, Ill.												
Negro	1,231	46.0	1.7	5.4	7.8	10.8	16.0	7.0	4.4	0.9	1,030	
White	29,501	10.6	2.0	2.6	4.9	7.3	19.5	19.5	21.0	12.6	1,710	

a/ Native-born unless otherwise specified.

b/ Medians have been rounded to the nearest \$5.

c/ See p. 327 for list of rural-farm counties, villages, and small cities.

d/ Native area only. See Appendix A

e/ "All families" include all native normal and broken families, weighted to take account of differences in coverage. For weights used see Bureau of Labor Statistics bulletins.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletins No. 643, 644, and 647, Vol. I, Tabular Summary Sections B and C, Table 1; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 375, Tables 4, 49, 91, 102, 112, and 147, and Miscellaneous Publication No. 462, Tables 8, 9, and 25.

refer only to normal families which had been residing on their present farms for at least one year.

The race differential in income, while marked for sharecroppers, was much larger for farm operators.⁸ As a matter of fact, the Negro farm operators often were not much better off than Negro sharecroppers. On the average they had incomes that approximated those of white sharecroppers. The median incomes of the white farm operators, on the other hand, were approximately 35 to 100 per cent higher than those of the white sharecroppers, although the white operators also included many very poor families. It was only in the unusually prosperous and probably unrepresentative cotton and tobacco counties sampled in North Carolina that there were practically no white operator families with less than \$500 annual income.⁹ In those counties even the Negro operators and the white sharecroppers had median incomes above \$1,000. In the North Carolina counties in which a sample of white self-sufficing farm operators was taken, the situation was quite different with more than one-third of the white farmers reported as being on relief during 1935-36.¹⁰ The median income for the white nonrelief self-sufficing families was lower than that for Negro operators in the cotton and tobacco counties sampled in the same state.

Several other recent studies also emphasize the lower incomes of Negro than white agricultural families in comparable areas. In the investigation of landlords and tenants on 646 cotton plantations as of 1934,¹¹ Negro sharecroppers were found to have a mean net income of \$295 as compared with \$417 for white sharecroppers.¹² This study also showed that southern agricultural wage hands were even worse off than sharecroppers. Negro wage hands with an aver-

⁸ A farm operator was defined as one who owns or rents a farm as entrepreneur; i.e., is engaged in the business of farming on his own account, assuming the risks and receiving the profits of the farm enterprise.

⁹ Certain items of business expense were not deducted: automobile and other transportation expense, food expense for farm employees, and such incidentals as farm periodicals and dues to farm business organizations. In consequence the net income figure is too high. Failure to make these deductions is less important for the South than for other regions, however.

¹⁰ This high figure probably refers not only to direct relief and work relief. It appears that some emergency grants made by the Resettlement Administration were also included in the relief figures.

¹¹ T. J. Woofter, Jr., and Others, *Landlord and Tenant on the Cotton Plantation*, Research Monograph V, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1936.

¹² *Ibid.*, unpublished data. These income figures are not directly comparable with the Consumer Purchases data. The value of housing and fuel and wages earned off the plantation was excluded. Also, although relief families were included in Woofter's study, their income from relief was not obtained. Finally, there were differences in sampling procedure.

age net income per family of only \$175 in 1934 were at the very bottom of the economic scale (Table 28), but since they had rather

Table 28. - Net Income^{a/} of Cotton-Plantation Tenant Families, by Tenure and Color, 1934^{b/}

Tenure	Net income per family		Net income per capita	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
All families c/ -	\$278	\$452	\$71	\$97
Wage hands -----	175	232	61	74
Sharecroppers -----	295	417	68	87
Other share tenants -----	320	558	72	113
Cash renters -----	307	568	97	118

a/ Net cash income from the plantation plus the value of home use production but excluding the value of housing and fuel, relief, and wages earned off the plantation.

b/ Crop year, 1934.

c/ The total sample included 5,093 families, over 4,000 of which were Negro families.

Sources: Work Projects Administration, Division of Research. Unpublished data from study of landlord and tenant on the cotton plantation, 1934.

small families their per capita income (\$61) was only slightly below that of Negro sharecroppers (\$68). The differential in income between Negro and white families increased with advances in tenure status with the differences smallest for wage hands and largest for cash renters. Data for Negro farm families in Greene and Macon counties in Georgia, although a restricted sample, provide additional evidence of the plight of Negro wage hands (Table 29).¹⁸

A recent survey of 188 Negro farm families, of which 53 were

Table 29. - Gross Income ^{a/} per Negro Farm Family in Greene and Macon Counties, Ga., by Tenure, 1927 and 1934

Year and county	Wage hands, etc.		Croppers		Renters	
	Number of families	Gross income per family	Number of families	Gross income per family	Number of families	Gross income per family
1927						
Greene . . .	14	t	57	\$342	56	\$408
Macon . . .	52	\$291	91	536	19	t
1934						
Greene . . .	27	112	30	282	45	417
Macon . . .	54	184	43	520	11	t

t Fewer than 25 cases.

a/ Includes nonfarm income, value of cash relief, money income from the farm, and production for home use but not the imputed value of the farm home.

Source: Arthur F. Raper, *Preface to Peasantry*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1936, pp. 33 and 55.

¹⁸ Since farm operating expenses have not been deducted from the income figures, the averages for renters and, to a lesser extent, for sharecroppers are too high.

renter and owner families, 285 white farm laborer families, and 181 white sharecropper families in Dunklin, Pemiscot, and New Madrid counties in southeast Missouri¹⁴ revealed that half of the Negro families had incomes below \$251, while half of the white farm laborers received less than \$264 and half of the white sharecroppers less than \$415.¹⁵ Even in the group of Negro farm families containing some tenants and owners but dominantly consisting of sharecroppers and laborers, incomes were below those of white farm laborers.

A group of 306 Negro sharecropper and wage-laborer families of two persons or more studied in the Arkansas River valley received an average total net income (cash income, plus fuel, home-use products, and rent equivalent of a house) in 1937 of \$425 for a family of 3.7 persons, considerably more than the Missouri Negroes of all tenure groups. The wage laborers received \$399, on the average, as against \$448 for the sharecroppers, but the latter had somewhat larger families so that the average income per capita was similar.¹⁶

A survey of the incomes of farm laborers in Todd County, Kentucky, conducted in 1936, indicates that neither whites nor Negroes were able to earn more than a bare subsistence.¹⁷ The average cash income for 69 white laborers was even lower (\$184) in this case than the corresponding figure for 221 Negro laborers (\$191). These

¹⁴ Max R. White, Douglas Ensminger, and Cecil L. Gregory, *Rich Land—Poor People*, Research Report No. I, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, Region III, Indianapolis, Ind., 1938, Chap. V.

¹⁵ "The source of these incomes was largely the value of the individual's share of the cotton crop or the wages received. However, the value of the crops sold, the value of livestock, poultry produce, and dairy produce sold, pensions, income from roomers and boarders, cash income from real estate and investments, AAA benefit checks, direct relief, and miscellaneous types of income are included. The value of products consumed on the farm is not included, but for the sharecropper and laborer, this is very small. . . .

"The day laborer is dependent for his income almost entirely upon what he and the members of his family can earn during the period of cotton chopping and picking. This is supplemented only by such small amounts as can be picked up by doing odd jobs or by relief. This means a most precarious existence for many thousand families in the seven Lowlands counties." (*Ibid.*, pp. 37-38.)

¹⁶ O. E. Leonard and C. P. Loomis, "A Study of Mobility and Levels of Living among Negro Sharecropper and Wage-Laborer Families of the Arkansas River Valley," *Farm Population and Rural Life Activities*, Vol. XIII, No. 2, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Washington, April 15, 1939, pp. 8-9.

¹⁷ Tom Vasey and Josiah C. Folsom, *Survey of Agricultural Labor Conditions in Todd County, Kentucky*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration and Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Washington, November, 1937, p. 6.

figures include relief and earnings of dependents as well as non-agricultural income.

In a comparable survey in Concordia Parish, Louisiana, Negro cotton pickers were found to have even lower incomes than farm workers in Todd County. Almost two-thirds of the 238 Negro laborers included in the survey reported total cash incomes below \$150 for the period from September, 1935, to August, 1936; and only one-eighth, incomes of \$250 or more.¹⁸

Much higher incomes were reported for 946 white and 216 Negro farm laborers in three New Jersey counties that were surveyed in 1935.¹⁹ The average annual income, including farm earnings, relief, and nonagricultural earnings, of the white male wage hands was \$752, while that of the Negro hands was \$490.

These data on farm laborers relate to relatively stable groups—either resident farm hands or casual workers that remain fairly settled in a given area. There is in addition the body of migratory-casual laborers concerning which it is even more difficult to obtain reliable information. It is common knowledge, however, that they are poorly paid and underemployed.²⁰

Southern Village Families

According to the Consumer Purchases Study white nonrelief families had a higher median income in southern villages (\$1,410) than in most farm areas of the South. Negro village families, on the other hand, appeared to be even worse off (\$395) than Negro farm operators and sharecroppers, and the race differential in income seemed to be much more pronounced in the villages than in the open country (Table 27). The main explanation probably is that the village sample, unlike the farm sample, included all low-income groups except broken families. The village data as well as the urban data, in other words, are more likely to give a correct picture of the general situation than the farm data.

The relief incidence in southern villages in 1935-36 was somewhat higher for Negroes (21 per cent) than for whites (16 per cent). The residual of families which had extremely low incomes

¹⁸ Tom Vasey and Josiah C. Folsom, *Survey of Agricultural Labor Conditions in Concordia Parish, Louisiana*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration and Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Washington, October, 1937, p. 8.

¹⁹ Josiah C. Folsom, *Farm Labor Conditions in Gloucester, Hunterdon, and Monmouth Counties, New Jersey, April-May 1936*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Washington, February, 1939, p. 44.

²⁰ See John N. Webb, *The Migratory-Casual Worker*, Monograph VII, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1937.

but failed to obtain public assistance was nevertheless much greater among Negroes. Seventeen per cent of all Negro families in comparison with less than one per cent of the white families did not receive any relief in 1935-36 although they had incomes of less than \$250. In relation to needs, relief unquestionably was much less available to Negroes than to whites in southern villages.

In spite of the significance of the southern village population, no other major income study contains data by race for this group.

Urban Families

The income pattern in the four small southern cities sampled in the Consumer Purchases Study was similar to that in the villages (Table 27). The incomes of whites were about the same for the two residence groups, while those of Negroes were somewhat higher in the small cities; but the race differential was almost as great as in the villages. The proportion of all families on relief was larger among Negroes than among whites, but it was nevertheless easier for a white low-income family than for a Negro family in similar circumstances to obtain public assistance.

The figures for Columbia, South Carolina, Mobile, Alabama, and Atlanta, Georgia, tell much the same story except that they indicate a higher income level. Yet only 3 per cent of the Negro normal families in Atlanta earned as much as \$2,000 or more in 1935-36. Atlanta was the only one of the seven cities sampled in the South in which the median income of normal nonrelief Negro families (\$760) was higher than that of white sharecroppers in most of the southern farm areas included in the Consumer Purchases Study. This comparatively high income figure is partly explained by the fact that one-third of the Negro families in Atlanta were on relief. There were few nonrelief families in the Negro population of the city which had less than \$250 income, but the proportion of those having less than \$500 was much higher in the Negro (13 per cent) than the white population (2 per cent).

The median incomes of normal nonrelief white families in both Columbia (\$1,975) and Atlanta (\$1,880) were higher than those for native-born whites in Columbus, Ohio (\$1,750), and Chicago (\$1,800) and not much lower than those for whites in New York (\$2,110). Nonrelief Negro families, on the other hand, had decidedly higher incomes in the three northern cities (\$1,030, \$1,130, and \$1,350, respectively) than in southern cities. This, however, has to be interpreted in conjunction with the fact that 40 per cent

or more of the Negro normal families in the three northern cities were on relief. As a consequence there were few nonrelief Negro families with incomes of less than \$500.

All of the urban data cited have referred to normal families only. Data for broken families by race were obtained for three southern and two northern cities. The median income for Negro nonrelief broken families was as low as \$275 in Mobile and \$300 in Columbia. More than one-third of all Negro broken families in these two cities were nonrelief families with annual incomes of less than \$250 (Table 27). The figures for the other three cities indicate a somewhat higher income level for Negro broken families.

The income levels of Negro and white families in urban areas in 1935 as found in the National Health Survey and in 1933 as reported in the Financial Survey of Urban Housing, while probably somewhat too low,²¹ nevertheless confirm the conclusions with regard to income differences between Negroes in the urban North and in the urban South (Appendix tables 20 and 21). In most southern cities less than 10 per cent of the Negro families had incomes of \$1,000 or more, while in most northern cities the proportion was considerably higher. In a few cities between 30 and 40 per cent of all Negro families reported incomes of \$1,000 and above.²² The two studies further confirm the fact that, by and large, white fami-

²¹ See Appendix A.

²² The following figures indicate the proportions of families with incomes of \$1,000 or more in seven cities which were covered by at least two of the three studies:

City	Negro or colored			White		
	Financial Survey of Urban Housing	National Health Survey	Consumer Purchases Study	Financial Survey of Urban Housing	National Health Survey	Consumer Purchases Study
Cleveland, Ohio.....	14.0	14.4	—	50.6	53.1	—
Columbus, Ohio.....	—	13.6	25.4	—	61.7	66.4
Chicago, Ill.....	—	31.8	28.3	—	66.9	72.6
Richmond, Va.....	9.7	13.5	—	75.2	71.7	—
Atlanta, Ga.....	7.2	4.8	13.1	68.0	61.7	65.9
Columbia, S. C.....	3.7	—	9.7	62.8	—	72.4
Birmingham, Ala.....	3.3	5.0	—	53.8	66.3	—

See Table 27 and Appendix tables 20 and 21.

The Consumer Purchases Study percentage is usually highest. The Financial Survey of Urban Housing, although taken in one of the worst depression years, sometimes indicates a higher income level than the National Health Survey. This seems to suggest that the National Health Survey figures, by and large, are the ones which are most likely to be too low.

lies were no better off on the average in the urban North than in the urban South so that the race differential in income was much larger in the South than in the North.

The study of the money disbursements of wage earners and clerical workers conducted by the U. S. Department of Labor during 1934-36 provides further supplementary information on income.²³ The samples, which are fairly small for the various cities, were selected to exclude families on relief, the nonrelief unemployed, and certain other low-income families. This would tend to make the race differentials in income appear smaller than for the total population. Yet the data indicate rather substantial income differences between whites and Negroes (Appendix table 22) and again confirm the fact that such differences are more pronounced in the South than in the North.

SOURCES OF FAMILY INCOME

The plane of living of a family in a given community is determined not only by the total family income but also by the sources of the income and the conditions under which it is produced. An urban family with three earners is likely to apportion its income in a different manner than a family of the same size and with the same income but with only one earner, the former allotting more for transportation and food away from home and perhaps also for clothing, amusement, and items of personal care. Likewise, the sex, age, and family relationships of earners are significant factors in determining the level of living of a family.

In the case of farm families the problem is not quite the same. The family income is more often secured from the same general source regardless of whether it is earned by one or more members of the family. It is important, however, to consider the proportion of income represented by cash and by farm-produced goods and the proportion derived from nonfarm work. The information on income in kind²⁴ is, of course, much less exact than the data on cash income. For that reason the breakdown of farm income by type is

²³ Income data were collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U. S. Department of Labor between 1934 and 1936 as part of a study of the money disbursements of families of employed wage earners and lower-salaried clerical workers in forty-two cities with over 50,000 population. Data for Negro families were obtained in sixteen of the cities.

²⁴ In the Consumer Purchases Study farm-produced goods were valued at the prices that would have been paid at the most likely place of purchase, whether at a neighbor's or at a local retail store.

of particular importance for an accurate evaluation of the data on total income which were presented in the previous section.

Farm Families

Data from the Consumer Purchases Study for nonrelief normal farm families living on the same farm for one year or more indicate that, except in Georgia, cash income from farm products was the most important source of income (Table 30). It amounted to 41 to 64 per cent of the total for the various groups in Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina. The absolute amount was highest for white operators in Mississippi (\$1,046), who received a little more even than operators in the unusually prosperous counties which were sampled in North Carolina (\$1,004). Negro operators consistently received much less than white operators. In Mississippi (\$340) they made only one-third as much as the white operators from their cash crops and other sources; in North Carolina (\$585) and South Carolina (\$274) they received little more than half of the corresponding income for whites. Sharecroppers, on the other hand, showed a much smaller race differential in income from sale of crops.

In Georgia income from cash crops and other sources was low for all groups. Even the white operators averaged only \$246, which was less than the Negro sharecroppers obtained in some of the other states. The same income item for white and Negro sharecroppers and Negro operators in Georgia ranged around \$150.

Income in kind from farm-furnished food represented the largest income item for all color and tenure groups in the Georgia counties sampled. It accounted for 41-54 per cent of the total income and was comparatively high even in absolute amounts. This seems to indicate that their exceedingly low cash-crop incomes had forced the Georgia farmers to increase production for home use.²⁵ Only the

²⁵ In this connection, Arthur F. Raper's findings as to the change, from 1927 to 1934, in the composition of the gross income of farm families in Greene and Macon counties, Alabama, are of considerable interest. Dr. Raper summarizes the situation as follows (*Preface to Peasantry*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1936, p. 54) :

"Between 1927 and 1934 the cash income per Negro family dwindled, while the value of home-grown provisions increased. . . . Even though the value of home-grown provisions has practically doubled in the last seven years, a great proportion of families . . . are still without meat and milk and vegetables from their own farms.

"In 1934 over half the total gross income of the Negro families in Greene was from home-grown provisions; the home-grown provisions of the whites in Greene

FAMILY INCOMES

75

Table 30. - Sources of Family Income and Proportion of Families with Nonfarm Earnings among Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Farm Families in Selected Groups of Southern Counties ^{a/}, by Tenure and Color, 1935-36

Source of income	Georgia (cotton)				Mississippi (cotton)			
	Farm operators		Sharecroppers		Farm operators		Sharecroppers	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Number of families in sample	222	723	222	221	275	495	933	310
Mean income								
Total	\$602	\$955	\$450	\$604	\$647	\$2,117	\$448	\$625
Money	230	449	175	203	416	1,566	295	332
Farm	189	322	153	171	382	1,349	275	295
Sale of crops and other ^{b/}	157	246	142	154	340	1,046	259	269
AAA benefit and rental payments	32	76	11	17	42	303	16	26
Nonfarm ^{c/}	41	127	22	32	34	217	20	37
Earnings	33	93	21	28	26	155	20	33
Other	8	34	1	4	8	59	-	4
Nonmoney	372	506	275	401	231	551	153	293
Farm furnished food	293	393	215	328	176	361	109	236
Other farm furnished products ^{d/}	42	39	39	36	30	34	26	30
Occupancy value of farm family dwelling	26	62	20	38	27	124	20	30
Net change in value of stock and crops stored	11	12	1	-1	-2	32	-2	-3
Per cent distribution								
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Money	38.2	47.0	38.9	33.6	64.3	74.0	65.8	53.1
Farm	31.4	33.7	34.0	28.3	59.1	63.7	61.4	47.8
Nonfarm	6.8	13.3	4.9	5.3	5.2	10.3	4.4	5.9
Nonmoney	61.8	53.0	61.1	66.4	35.7	25.0	34.2	46.9
Farm furnished food	48.7	41.1	47.8	54.3	27.2	17.0	24.3	37.8
Other	13.1	11.9	13.3	12.1	8.5	9.0	9.0	9.1
Per cent of families with nonfarm earnings	29	31	40	32	55	35	61	44

Table 30. - Sources of Family Income and Proportion of Families with Nonfarm Earnings among Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Farm Families in Selected Groups of Southern Counties ^{a/}, by Tenure and Color, 1935-36 (continued)

Source of income	North Carolina (cotton and tobacco)				South Carolina (cotton and tobacco)			
	Farm operators		Sharecroppers		Farm operators		Sharecroppers	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Number of families in sample	128	458	393	294	477	2,046	276	215
Mean income								
Total	\$1,124	\$1,988	\$852	\$1,084	\$666	\$1,438	\$471	\$698
Money	659	1,276	583	643	321	817	271	365
Farm	625	1,065	510	619	288	585	239	317
Sale of crops & other ^{b/}	585	1,004	492	602	274	522	231	307
AAA benefit & rental payments	40	61	18	17	14	63	8	10
Nonfarm ^{c/}	34	211	13	24	43	232	32	46
Earnings	17	57	12	22	37	200	29	44
Other	17	154	1	2	6	38	3	4
Nonmoney	465	712	339	441	335	621	200	333
Farm furnished food	359	525	257	344	260	453	144	252
Other farm furnished products ^{d/}	28	32	29	30	38	43	32	32
Occupancy value of farm family dwelling	58	111	44	60	32	99	23	43
Net change in value of stock and crops stored	20	44	-1	7	5	26	1	6
Per cent distribution								
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Money	58.6	64.2	61.4	59.3	49.7	56.8	57.5	52.3
Farm	55.6	53.6	59.9	57.1	43.2	40.7	50.7	45.4
Nonfarm	3.0	10.6	1.5	2.2	6.5	16.1	6.8	6.9
Nonmoney	41.4	35.8	38.6	40.7	50.3	43.2	48.5	47.7
Farm furnished food	31.9	26.4	30.1	31.7	39.0	31.5	30.6	36.1
Other	9.5	9.6	8.5	9.0	11.3	11.7	11.9	11.6
Per cent of families with non-farm earnings	20	16	22	16	45	40	52	38

^{a/} See p. 327 for list of counties.

^{b/} Includes net income from wage work off the family farm that involved both the labor of family members and the use of the family's work stock, machinery, and other farm equipment.

^{c/} Business losses have been disregarded.

^{d/} Includes fuel, ice, and tobacco.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 462, Tables 26, 29, 33, 34, 36, 39, and 45; and unpublished data.

North Carolina families sampled and the white operators in South Carolina showed higher figures for farm-produced food than did the corresponding groups in Georgia. Mississippi farm families produced least for home consumption. The average value of the food which Negro sharecroppers in Mississippi raised for home consumption was only \$109. The race difference was more consistent in regard to this item than in regard to income from cash crops.

On the other hand, the proportion of the income which was obtained in the form of farm-produced food was consistently higher for Negro than white operators.²⁶ The situation with regard to sharecroppers, however, was just the reverse. The percentages were consistently smaller for Negro than white sharecroppers, although the difference was not always significant.

Among other income items, it was found that white operators in Mississippi received by far the largest average AAA payments (\$303). Other white operators received from \$61 to \$74 from this source and Negro operators from \$14 to \$42. Payments to sharecroppers usually averaged \$10 to \$20 for both whites and Negroes. Another of the smaller items was nonfarm cash earnings, mainly wages received for work off the operators' or croppers' own farms; e.g., in industrial activities²⁷ or on farms of other people. The Negro sharecroppers did not make more than \$12 to \$29 on the average in this way and the Negro operators and white sharecroppers only slightly more. Some of the white operators, however, particularly those in South Carolina (\$200) and Mississippi (\$158), reported appreciable additions to their incomes from this source. Other nonfarm cash receipts were of significance only for some groups of white operators, particularly those in North Carolina (\$154). Although Negroes had smaller nonfarm incomes than whites, the proportion of families with nonfarm income was generally higher among Negroes. The average number of nonfarm earners per fam-

and of the farmers of both races in Macon, though more valuable, in no instance equalled their cash income. The low gross income of the Negro farmer in Greene is not the result of a bad ratio between cash income and food produced at home, but of both a low cash income and a low production of foods."

²⁶ The sample included only families living on the same farm for one year or more. It is probable that production for home consumption constituted a higher proportion of the total income than among families which had moved during the year.

²⁷ It is estimated that about one-third of the rural families in the United States combine some industrial activity with farming. (See T. J. Woofter, Jr., and Ellen Winston, *Seven Lean Years*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1939, p. 23.)

ily was much higher among Negroes.²⁸ The differences reflect the greater pressure on Negro families to supplement the low incomes derived from the operation of their farms. The variations among areas in the average number of nonfarm earners undoubtedly are largely attributable to varying opportunities for work off the farm.

Since advances in the form of credit were included in cash income in the Consumer Purchases Study, Woofter's study of plantation families in 1934 may be utilized for detailed information concerning subsistence advances to sharecroppers (Appendix table 23). The largest single groups of sharecroppers on cotton plantations received from \$50 to \$74 for the year whether Negroes or whites. The wide variations in the amount of such advances are partially explained by the varying periods for which advances were made. The average number of months was 6.9.²⁹ The prevailing practice of charging a flat rate of interest regardless of the duration of the loans, which averaged 3.6 months, resulted in an average annual interest rate on subsistence advances of 37 per cent.³⁰

Nonfarm Families

Among normal families in southeastern villages the principal earners contributed a somewhat smaller share of the family income in 1935-36 in the Negro than the white population (Appendix table 24). On the other hand, the contributions of supplementary earners were of greater significance among Negro than white families. Homegrown food constituted a relatively more important item in the incomes of Negro village families than in those of white families. While the average amounts of such income were small, more than half of the village families reported this income item.

²⁸ Average Number of Nonfarm Earners in Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Farm Families in Selected Groups of Southern Counties, by Tenure and Color, 1935-36.

State	Farm operators		Sharecroppers	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
Georgia.....	0.45	0.39	0.56	0.41
Mississippi.....	0.94	0.38	0.93	0.53
North Carolina.....	0.22	0.20	0.33	0.18
South Carolina.....	0.76	0.48	0.89	0.54

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 462, Tables 37 and 38.

²⁹ T. J. Woofter, Jr., and Others, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

Table 31. - Source of Income of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal, and Broken Families in 5 Southern Cities, by Color, 1935-36

Source of income	Columbia, S. C.		Mobile, Ala.		Atlanta, Ga.		Albany, Ga.		Gastonia, N. C.	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
NORMAL FAMILIES										
Number of families in sample - - -	1,837	4,323	2,589	4,875	3,703	12,405	956	947	437	2,072
Total income - - - - -	\$ 743	\$2,408	\$ 649	\$1,832	\$ 888	\$2,158	\$556	\$2,221	\$574	\$1,483
Per cent distribution										
Total - - - - -	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Money income - - - - -	96.4	94.8	96.1	95.3	96.3	96.0	97.8	96.5	96.9	97.1
Earnings - - - - -	94.0	89.6	93.3	91.1	92.9	92.1	94.4	90.5	95.5	94.9
Principal earner - - - -	76.0	78.8	78.5	80.2	73.7	79.3	76.1	82.0	76.1	75.7
Supplementary earners - -	16.2	9.1	13.9	9.9	17.2	11.2	17.2	7.3	18.7	17.7
Other - - - - -	1.8	1.7	0.9	1.0	2.0	1.6	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.5
Nonearned income - - - -	2.4	5.2	2.8	4.2	3.4	3.9	3.4	6.0	1.4	2.2
Nonmoney income from housing - -	3.6	5.2	3.9	4.7	3.7	4.0	2.2	3.5	3.1	2.9
BROKEN FAMILIES										
Number of families in sample - -	104	75	166	127	138	223	113	26	63	65
Total income - - - - -	\$374	\$1,944	\$339	\$1,293	\$485	\$1,333	\$247	t	\$361	\$1,013
Per cent distribution										
Total - - - - -	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	t	100.0	100.0
Money income - - - - -	93.0	91.2	95.0	90.0	95.9	91.5	97.6	t	92.2	91.9
Earnings - - - - -	88.5	77.7	85.0	68.7	93.0	78.2	91.1	t	87.2	85.2
Principal earner - - - -	68.8	46.2	68.2	54.4	65.6	55.7	71.7	t	72.0	57.2
Supplementary earners - -	14.4	19.4	11.5	11.0	21.4	16.4	17.8	t	13.8	23.4
Other - - - - -	4.3	12.1	5.3	3.3	6.0	6.1	1.6	t	1.4	4.6
Nonearned income - - - -	4.5	13.5	10.0	21.3	2.9	13.3	6.5	t	5.0	6.7
Nonmoney income from housing - -	7.0	8.8	5.0	10.0	4.1	8.5	2.4	t	7.8	8.1

t Fewer than 50 cases.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 647, Vol. I, Tabular Summary, Sec. B, Tables 2, 3, 4, and 6, and Sec. C, Tables 4, 5, and 6.

Among nonrelief native-born families in five southern cities included in the Consumer Purchases Study, 75 to 80 per cent of the total income of normal families was generally accounted for by the cash earnings of the principal earner (Table 31). The proportion was usually a little lower for Negro than white families, but the differences were not significant. The race difference was more pronounced in regard to the contributions from supplementary earners, which were proportionately higher in Negro families.

Broken white families differed from normal white families in that the principal earners in the former contributed a much smaller proportion of the total income. This was true also in the case of Negro normal and broken families; but the difference was much smaller, as the principal earner in Negro broken families played a larger role in the family economy, relatively speaking, than the principal earner in white broken families. In absolute amounts, however, the earnings reported by Negro broken families were small compared with those of the principal earners in white broken families. In Atlanta, for example, the family's income from principal earners averaged \$318 in broken Negro families as against \$742 in broken white families. Nonearned money income (from pensions, annuities, rents, dividends, and the like) played rather a large role in some cities for white broken families but was of considerably less significance among Negro families.

The number of supplementary earners was much larger among

Table 32. - Average Earnings per Family of Principal and Secondary Earners, Number and Average Earnings of Supplementary Earners, and Median Income per Family by Number of Earners among Native-born, Nonrelief Families in 5 Southern Cities, by Color, 1935-36

Item	Columbia, S. C.	Mobile, Ala.	Atlanta, Ga.	Albany, Ga.	Gastonia, N. C.
Earnings per family					
Principal earner					
Negro	\$ 565	\$ 510	\$ 654	\$ 423	\$ 437
White	1,698	1,470	1,712	1,880	1,122
Supplementary earners					
Negro	\$ 180	\$ 90	\$ 153	\$ 96	\$ 107
White	219	161	241	163	263
Number of supplementary earners per family					
Negro	0.75	0.63	0.68	0.86	0.78
White	0.33	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.61
Average earnings of all supplementary earners					
Negro	\$ 159	\$ 142	\$ 226	\$ 112	\$ 137
White	655	506	663	450	430
Median income of normal families with one earner					
Negro	\$ 624	\$ 532	\$ 677	\$ 468	\$ 464
White	1,913	1,417	1,775	1,730	1,011
Two earners or more					
Negro	\$ 645	\$ 602	\$ 872	\$ 458	\$ 560
White	2,254	1,927	2,299	2,050	1,284

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 647, Vol. I, Table 54 and Tabular Summary, Sec. B, Tables 3 and 6.

Negro than white normal families, indicating that Negro families try to make up for the small earnings of the principal earner by having several earners per family (Table 32). In terms both of earnings per family and of earnings per individual worker, however, Negro supplementary workers made much less than whites.

THE RELATION OF FAMILY SIZE AND AGE COMPOSITION TO FAMILY INCOME

Thus far the analysis of family income has considered all families regardless of size. It is obvious, however, that when evaluating the level of living it is important to study variations in income by family composition. Does income increase with the size of the family and, if so, in such a way that large and small families have about the same level of living? If family income rises with an increasing number of members, why does this happen? Is it because larger families tend to have more members of working age or because the family head is more often in the most productive age group? Is it only households with many adult members which tend to have higher incomes than small families, or does the income increase also with the number of minor children?

These problems are even more significant for Negroes than for whites. While it is always serious if living conditions tend to become lower as the size of the family, and particularly the number of minor children, increases, such a tendency is of greatest import when the plane of living is low to begin with.

By means of a family-type classification⁸¹ the Consumer Pur-

⁸¹ Normal families were classified into the following types on the basis of the number and age of members other than husband and wife:

- I—No other person (families of 2).
- II—One child under 16 (families of 3).
- III—Two children under 16 (families of 4).
- IV—One person 16 or over and one or no other person regardless of age (families of 3 or 4).
- V—One child under 16, one person 16 or over, and one or two others regardless of age (families of 5 or 6).
- VI—Three or four children under 16 (families of 5 or 6).
- VII—One child under 16 and 4 or 5 others regardless of age (families of 7 or 8).
- VIII—Three or four persons 16 or over (families of 5 or 6).
- Other—All types not listed above.

By comparing types I, II, III, and VI it is possible to judge the relationship between income and the number of children under 16 years of age. As most of the other groups, however, are more or less heterogeneous, it is more difficult to find the relation between family income and the number of adult family members. Type I (2 adults) and type VIII (5-6 adults) can be compared, but there is no clear-cut intermediary group; type IV comes nearest to it. It is possible, however, to rearrange this family grouping into a rough classification by total membership. As

chases Study provides at least partial answers to most of the questions raised. The income of normal farm families in the South in both the Negro and the white groups showed a definite tendency to increase with increases in the total number of members in the household (Appendix table 25). In the case of nonrelief Negro sharecroppers, for instance, the median income was \$325 for two-person families and \$530 for families of five or more persons. The number of children under 16 years of age, on the other hand, seemed to have little or no consistent influence on the income of nonrelief families except in the case of white farm operators.³² This exception is accounted for in part by the fact that the relief incidence for the group showed a pronounced tendency to increase with the number of children under 16. Consequently, the relative number of nonrelief families with an annual income of less than \$1,000 declined as the number of children rose.

The relief incidence increased also with family size in general in the case of white farm operators. White sharecroppers showed a similar trend, although it was more irregular. The proportion of relief families in the Negro group, on the other hand, did not show any consistent tendency to increase either with family size in general or with the number of minor children. Only 2 to 3 per cent of Negro farm families consisting of two adults and three to four children were on relief as compared with 9 per cent for white sharecroppers and 17 per cent for white operators of the same family type. Not only did the relief agencies in this sample of southern farm counties pay less attention in general to the Negro, but they also failed to consider the fact that large Negro families, and particularly those with several minor children, must be in need of public assistance more often than the smaller normal families in the Negro population.

In southern villages income generally increased with family size. It did not rise, however, with the increase in number of minor children. White families even showed an inverse relationship between income and number of children under 16 years of age. The relief incidence generally increased with family size and number of chil-

some of the original types were lumped together in the rural material, even this crude classification of family size has a fairly restricted value in regard to farm families. Those of the original family types which are comparatively well defined are, however, also included in the tables.

³² Negro sharecroppers also showed some variations in this respect, but they were rather small, except that two-person families had a median income (\$325) well below that of families comprising two adults and one to four children under 16 (\$390 to \$420). This is not very significant, however, since childless couples include a higher proportion of very young and very old families than families with children.

dren, but this tendency was somewhat less pronounced for Negroes than whites.

Corresponding data for four cities (Columbia, South Carolina; Mobile, Alabama; Atlanta, Georgia; and Columbus, Ohio) give a somewhat less clearcut picture (Appendix table 26). In only two of the cities (Mobile and Columbus) did the median income of white nonrelief families show a consistent tendency to increase with family size. Among Negro families income increased with increases in family size in the three southern cities but not in Columbus. This tendency, however, even where it did exist, was partly fictitious in that the relief incidence always increased with family size so that the trend would have been less pronounced had the income data referred to families regardless of relief status. It should be noted that the tendency of large families to have relatively more representatives on the relief rolls than small families was about as strong for Negroes as for whites in Columbia and Mobile but was less pronounced for Negroes than for whites in Atlanta and Columbus.

The somewhat incomplete data for family groups consisting of three or four and five or six adults, respectively, indicate that there was a definite positive relationship between family income and the number of members 16 years of age and over. Nowhere in these four cities, on the other hand, did any consistent positive relationship between income and number of children appear. Atlanta even showed a negative relationship for both Negroes and whites. Such negative relationships probably would have appeared more often had it not been for the variations in the relief incidence.

In none of the community groups examined did family income show such a tendency to increase that it can be assumed that large families enjoyed the same average level of living as small families.³³ It is particularly evident that the plane of living among both Negroes and whites tended to be inversely correlated with the number of children under 16 years of age. This tendency seemed to be more pronounced in urban than rural areas, but the difference was counteracted to some extent by the greater tendency of the urban relief agencies to consider the special problems of the large Negro and white families.

It has previously been pointed out that there may be two reasons why incomes tend to be larger in families with many rather than few

³³ It should be remembered that the rural data do not refer to the total population of Negroes and whites but to two specific socio-economic groups only. Data for the total rural population probably would have shown less relationship between income and family size.

adult members: the fact that there are more gainful workers per family as the number of adults increases and the fact that the heads of families with several adults are more likely to fall into age groups where earnings tend to be highest.

Table 33 shows for three southern cities how the family income as well as the earnings of those husbands who were the principal earners in their families fluctuated with age of husband. These fluctuations appeared to be rather large for whites. The earnings seemed to increase with age at least up to 40-50 years, to remain nearly unchanged for a time, and then to become definitely lower after the age of 64. Among Negroes variations of this kind were much smaller. In view of the fact that the data on earnings apply only to nonrelief cases and that the relief incidence, at least in regard to Negroes, tended to increase with the age of the husband, this upward trend with age would be even less pronounced if the information on earnings covered relief cases as well as nonrelief families. This significant race differential is obviously explained by the fact that Negroes have little chance of advancement and that they are concentrated in occupations in which age makes relatively little difference in earning power.

EVALUATION OF THE INCOMES OF NEGRO AND WHITE FAMILIES IN TERMS OF MINIMUM STANDARD BUDGETS

Some of the difficulties in defining a minimum standard of living were touched upon in the general introduction to this volume. A minimum standard may refer to what is necessary to maintain a person in fairly good condition for a limited time only, but it may also refer to what is needed in order to keep him permanently in good health. There is fairly general agreement on these requirements in regard to nutrition. The agreement is somewhat less complete in regard to housing, and in regard to most other items there is considerable difference of opinion. Moreover, the translation of the basic hygienic requirements into costs often can be done in a number of ways. For instance, there is a wide choice in providing a diet with the required calories, proteins, vitamins, and minerals. The theoretically cheapest diet would be preferred but only if it did not differ too much from actual consumption habits. Otherwise it would be necessary to make some adjustments, not to the extent of obviously uneconomical consumption patterns but so that the minimum food allowance in actual practice would enable at least the most economical families to secure an adequate diet. The housing item in a minimum budget may be difficult to determine on account of the fact that the

Table 35. - Per Cent of Native-born, Normal Families on Relief, Median Income of Nonrelief Families, and Mean Earnings of Husbands in Nonrelief Families ^{a/} in 3 Southern Cities, by Age of Husband and color, 1935-36

City and age of husband ^{a/}	Negro				White			
	Number of families in sample	Per cent of families on relief	Median income of nonrelief families	Mean earnings of husbands in nonrelief families which they are principal earners ^{b/}	Number of families in sample	Per cent of families on relief	Median income of nonrelief families	Mean earnings of husbands in nonrelief families which they are the principal earners ^{b/}
Columbia, S. C.								
20-29 years	492	14.6	\$560	\$474	520	6.2	\$1,260	\$1,198
30-39 years	608	17.9	630	572	1,362	5.3	1,855	1,650
40-49 years	660	20.6	695	660	1,391	9.3	2,300	2,211
50-59 years	331	25.7	720	694	906	10.8	2,425	2,356
60-64 years	94	23.4	655	756	279	10.6	2,220	2,139
65 years and over	89	34.9	585	515	256	11.7	2,250	1,637
Mobile, Ala.								
20-29 years	585	16.6	490	448	650	8.3	1,140	1,135
30-39 years	997	19.0	593	569	1,559	7.1	1,440	1,489
40-49 years	931	26.5	605	579	1,452	8.6	1,760	1,779
50-59 years	487	26.9	610	541	1,031	13.0	1,700	1,600
60-64 years	127	32.3	605	601	313	12.1	1,700	1,662
65 years and over	162	33.5	445	467	372	11.6	1,480	1,372
Atlanta, Ga.								
20-29 years	802	23.6	655	528	1,842	10.5	1,375	1,313
30-39 years	1,736	29.0	745	653	4,325	10.7	1,835	1,752
40-49 years	1,466	32.9	840	758	3,900	14.1	2,085	2,026
50-59 years	911	39.0	870	778	2,520	15.7	2,155	2,020
60-64 years	267	44.6	740	654	812	16.7	1,945	1,940
65 years and over	354	50.9	790	680	918	19.6	1,780	1,791

^{a/} The few families with husbands under 20 years of age were excluded.

^{b/} The number of families in which the husband is the principal earner is smaller than the number of families in the sample.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 647, Vol. I, Tabular Summary, Sec. B, Tables 6 and 18.

housing cost often varies for the same kind of dwelling unit. The fact that some families in a city have been able to obtain an adequate home at moderate expense does not mean that this figure can be quoted in a minimum budget intended for all families. The most widely accepted quantity budgets drawn up in recent years are those prepared by the Works Progress Administration in 1935 for a four-person manual worker's family at two levels of living, termed "maintenance" and "emergency" levels, respectively. The character of the two levels is summarized as follows.⁸⁴

The basic *maintenance* level represents normal or average minimum requirements for industrial, service, and other manual workers; the *emergency* level takes into account certain economies which may be made under depression conditions. The maintenance level provides not only for physical needs but also gives some consideration to psychological values. The emergency level allows more exclusively, though not entirely, for material wants, but it might be questioned on the grounds of health hazards if families had to live at this level for a considerable period of time.

The family whose costs of living are measured in this investigation is best described as the unskilled manual worker type. It consists of a moderately active man, a moderately active woman, a boy age 13, and a girl age 8. The man wears overalls at his work. No household assistance of any kind is employed. . . .

All the essentials of living are to be purchased at market prices; the budgets make no provision for homegrown food or home dressmaking. Complete self-support in all respects is provided for, but only on a current cost basis, since there is no allowance for carrying or liquidating debts or for necessary future expenditures, except small life insurance policies.

These two budgets were priced in March, 1935, in six of the cities in which Negro and white samples were taken in the Consumer Purchases Study in 1935-36 and in twenty cities in which colored and white families were sampled in the National Health Survey in 1935-36, so that it is possible to make direct comparisons. These comparisons are limited to the budget for an emergency level, which averaged \$903 for the fifty-nine cities studied.⁸⁵ The so-called maintenance level (\$1,261) appears at present to be completely beyond the means of the general Negro population, particularly in the South.

⁸⁴ Margaret Loomis Stecker, *Intercity Differences in Cost of Living in March 1935, 59 Cities*. Research Monograph XII, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1937, pp. xxi-xiv.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. xix.

The main items in the emergency budget were as follows :

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Food</i>	<i>Housing</i>	<i>Household operation</i>	<i>Clothing and personal care</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>
Amount...	\$903	\$340	\$168	\$122	\$128	\$145
Per cent...	100	37	19	14	14	16

The food allowances used in drawing up the emergency level were based on plans worked out by the Bureau of Home Economics of the U. S. Department of Agriculture for a restricted diet for emergency use.³⁶ The cost was somewhat lower than the minimum amount for which families sampled in the study of employed wage earners and clerical workers in cities were able to purchase a "good" diet (about \$400 per year for a four-person family) but much higher than the lowest amount which was found necessary in practice for obtaining a "fair" diet (roughly \$200 for a four-person family); i.e., a diet which could be used for a limited time but, on the other hand, would represent certain health risks if adhered to for long periods.³⁷ The housing facilities provided for in the emergency budget were supposed to refer to dwelling units consisting of four or five rooms in a fair state of repair, meeting requirements in local housing codes, and having a private toilet but not a private indoor bathroom.³⁸ The average amount (\$168) was far below the general mean rental for 52 cities in 1933 according to the Financial Survey of Urban Housing (\$263) and the median rental for 202 urban areas³⁹ covered by real property inventories made in 1934-36 (\$272).⁴⁰ About one out of four of all tenant-occupied dwelling units in the 202 urban areas had rentals below the emergency standard allowance of \$168, but a

³⁶ This diet and an adequate diet at minimum cost were rather widely used by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. Out of a total of 36 states reporting to the FERA office in Washington in 1934 and 1935, 18 had accepted either the adequate diet at minimum cost or its equivalent as the permissible minimum allowance for relief families, while 10 had accepted the restricted level for emergency use and the remaining 8 had variants of these food budget levels. (See Mary Aylett Nicol, "Family Relief Budgets," *Monthly Report of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, June 1 through June 30, 1936*, Washington, p. 143.)

³⁷ See Chapter VII, p. 102. That this emergency-level diet is rather monotonous is indicated by the fact that 24 per cent of the food expense is for flour, cereals, and bread (Margaret Loomis Stecker, *op. cit.*, p. 14), whereas the corresponding figure for Negro and white families in Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga., with an income of \$500-\$999 was 16 and 17 per cent, respectively. (See Table 40.)

³⁸ Margaret Loomis Stecker, *op. cit.*, p. 101. The method used for computing emergency-level rents consisted mainly in taking about 75 per cent of the housing cost in the maintenance level budget which referred to four- to five-room dwellings with private bath (*Ibid.*, p. 106).

³⁹ Exclusive of New York City.

⁴⁰ *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1938*, p. 846; and Peyton Stapp, *Urban Housing: A Summary of Real Property Inventories Conducted as Work Projects, 1934-1936*, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, p. 24.

large proportion of these low-priced dwelling units must have been either in a poor state of repair or too small for a family of four members.⁴¹

The remaining items in the emergency budget cannot be properly evaluated in a brief discussion. Suffice it to say that at least they do not appear to be high. The clothing budget seems particularly meager with provision, for example, for purchase by the employed man of one winter suit and one summer suit, respectively, only once in five years.⁴²

The cost in five cities of the budget prepared for an emergency level of living is shown in Table 34 together with the incomes of Negro and white families in these cities as shown by the Consumer Purchases Study. In Atlanta, Columbia, and Mobile about 80 to 85 per cent of the Negro normal families having two children under 16 received incomes below the estimated cost in March, 1935, when prices were slightly lower than during the full period 1935-36, of a budget that represents an emergency level of living for a family containing husband, wife, boy aged 13, and girl aged 8. The situation was somewhat better in Columbus, Ohio, but even there the majority of Negro families received incomes below the emergency level. Among the corresponding white families, including those in Chicago, Illinois, only 13 to 27 per cent had incomes below the emergency level.

As previously indicated, the income distributions of Negro and white families were somewhat lower according to the National Health Survey findings than according to findings of the Consumer Purchases Study. It is not surprising, therefore, that in all of the southern cities and in all of the northern cities except New York, Chicago, Detroit, Boston, and Newark, New Jersey, covered in the Health Survey in which the emergency level budget was priced, the median incomes of all nonrelief colored families sampled were substantially below the cost of this budget. (See Appendix table 20. The median incomes for white nonrelief families were considerably above the cost of the emergency budget, but even so there were many nonrelief white families with incomes insufficient to provide this restricted level of living.

⁴¹ *Idem.* Of all dwelling units in the 202 urban places 16 per cent were designated as either in need of major repairs or unfit for use, 15 per cent were without private toilet, 7 per cent had only one to two rooms, and 18 per cent had one to three rooms (*Ibid.*, pp. 17, 18, and 19). These groups, of course, are largely overlapping, but in all probability included most of the low-priced dwelling units.

⁴² See Margaret Loomis Stecker, *Quantity Budgets for Basic Maintenance and Emergency Standards of Living*, Research Bulletin Series I, No. 21, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1936, p. 15.

Table 34. - Comparison of the Incomes Received during 1935-36 by Families in 5 Cities Included in the Consumer Purchases Study with the Cost of the WPA Budget for an Emergency Level of Living Priced in the Same Cities in March, 1935, by Color

Item	Negro					White				
	Columbia, S. C.	Mobile, Ala.	Atlanta, Ga.	Columbus, Ohio	Chicago, Ill.	Columbia, S. C.	Mobile, Ala.	Atlanta, Ga.	Columbus, Ohio	Chicago, Ill.
Cost of WPA emergency budget for a manual worker's family with 2 children under 16 - - - - -	\$845	\$815	\$811	\$841	\$973	\$845	\$815	\$811	\$841	\$973
Normal families with 2 children under 16										
Median income for those not receiving relief - - - - -	\$555	\$495	\$575	\$940	t	\$1,860	\$1,325	\$1,785	\$1,650	\$1,735
Per cent with incomes above cost of budget a/ - - - - -	19.2	16.3	16.4	32.6	t	82.0	72.6	76.4	79.4	86.8
All normal families - - - - -										
Average number of members - - - - -	4.0	3.7	3.9	3.7	b/	3.9	4.1	3.8	3.6	3.6
Median income for those not receiving relief - - - - -	\$635	\$565	\$760	\$1,030	\$1,130	\$1,975	\$1,535	\$1,880	\$1,750	\$1,800
Per cent with incomes above cost of budget a/ - - - - -	21.9	18.6	23.9	42.2	37.6	82.2	75.7	74.9	79.7	77.9

t Fewer than 50 cases.

a/ Calculated on the assumption that no families which had received relief at any time during the year had incomes above the cost of the emergency budget.

b/ Data not available.

Sources: Margaret Louis Stecker, Intercity Differences in Costs of Living in March 1935, 59 Cities, Research Monograph XII, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1937, pp. 172-175; and U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletins No. 642, 644, and 647, Vol. I, passim.

Chapter VI

FAMILY EXPENDITURES

While income provides a rough measure of the material level of family living, when family size and composition are taken into account, it must be recognized that income determines the limits of consumer expenditures only over an extended period of time. During any given year a family may live on a plane considerably above or below that which the current income could provide. Even information on total annual expenditures does not provide an adequate measure of a family's level of living, since expenditures may be apportioned in many different ways. Hence in order to obtain a realistic picture of family living both the amounts spent for different categories of consumption and the quantities of various goods and services purchased will be considered.

What an income is worth and why expenditures are apportioned in a particular manner depend not only on family size and the level of prices but also on the types of durable goods already owned by the family,¹ family tastes and consumption habits, the extent of the housewife's services, and the efficiency in buying of the family members, on the one hand, and the resources and degree of organization of the community, on the other hand. While these latter factors cannot be explicitly measured, they must be taken into account when making comparisons among families in communities of differing degrees of urbanization and in different regions.

¹ The particular period covered by a study of family living has an important bearing both on the balance of income and expenditures and on the apportionment of expenditures. In a period of improving economic conditions, replacements of durable consumer goods are relatively heavy to make up for economies during years of heavy financial pressure. In 1935-36, the period to which most of the consumption data presented below refer, business conditions were on the upgrade, but many families were still living on incomes far below those which they had enjoyed in the late twenties. Hence home ownership and ownership of automobiles and expensive articles of household equipment by families at the lowest income levels represent a carry-over rather than a plane of living that could characteristically be maintained at the income level of 1935-36.

The Consumer Purchases Study,² which provided the central core of the discussion of family incomes, is the main source of information on the consumption of Negro and white families. In addition, the study of the money disbursements of employed wage earners and clerical workers contains detailed data on the expenditures of Negro families in sixteen cities.³ The sample is so limited in its applicability, however, and the number of cases studied in each city is so small that no analysis of the data will be presented except in the chapter on food. A number of surveys of family living of limited scope have been conducted in recent years by governmental agencies. As they were generally planned to throw light on a particular problem area or an isolated group, their usefulness in obtaining a well-rounded picture of Negro and white family living conditions is limited. Data from such studies will be utilized therefore only when they bear upon aspects of living not covered by the Consumer Purchases Study or when they serve to test the findings of that study.

Unfortunately, relief families were excluded entirely from the expenditure sample of the Consumer Purchases Study. Moreover, information in regard to the consumption of relief families is lacking from all other major consumption studies which give significant information by race. Other groups excluded from the expenditure sample of the Consumer Purchases Study were broken families, farm laborers, and sharecroppers and farm operators that had been on their farms less than one year.⁴ In addition, the small groups of nonrelief families with very low incomes were omitted from the city and village samples. In general, however, any particular bias which may have been introduced by the restrictions on the sample is pointed out in the analysis.

Expenditure data from the Consumer Purchases Study for Negro and white families are presented for Atlanta, Georgia, Columbus, Ohio, and New York, New York, separately; for Columbia, South Carolina, and Mobile, Alabama, two southern middle-sized cities, together; for four small southern cities as a group; for thirty-four southern villages as a group; and for farm operators and sharecroppers separately both in selected Georgia and Mississippi cotton counties and in North Carolina and South Carolina cotton and tobacco counties. Because of the small number of families supplying expenditure data on the details of food, clothing, furnishings and

² See Appendix A.

³ *Idem.*

⁴ *Idem.*

equipment, and other items covered, further combinations of community groups are made in the detailed analyses.⁵

THE BALANCE OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURES

While the primary interest is in the consumption of various goods and services by Negro and white families, there are several reasons for first considering the balance between current annual income and annual expenditures for current living. This balance reflects to some extent the adequacy of income to meet the needs, if not the wants, of any given group. It is, of course, also influenced by other factors, such as the ability to plan the family economy and to obtain credit and the existence of past savings of one sort or another which can be used to supplement current income. The relation between income and expenditures, or the net surplus or deficit, also throws some light, particularly at the middle and upper income levels, on the attitudes of families toward savings.

It is true that data on the difference between income and expenditures may be affected by an accumulation of errors in the reporting of both income and expenditure items. In the Consumer Purchases Study, however, this information was substantiated by data on changes in family assets and liabilities; i.e., changes in the size of bank accounts, in amounts invested, in amounts borrowed or loaned, in charge or installment accounts outstanding, in mortgages outstanding, in insurance-premium payments, and the like.⁶

According to this latter type of data, in nine of the ten communities or groups of communities for which information on expenditures was obtained from Negro families in the Consumer Purchases Study the aggregate income of nonrelief Negro families exceeded their aggregate expenditures (Table 35). True their surpluses were not large, averaging \$55 or less for the year as against surpluses of \$54 to \$281 for the nine white communities or groups of communities which showed surpluses. It seems probable that if relief families had been taken into account the net figure for Negro families in all nonfarm communities studied would have been a deficit. Compared with white nonrelief families, the Negro families sampled appeared at a marked disadvantage, except in the case of southern sharecroppers, with regard to the balance of income and expendi-

⁵ For size of samples, see Appendix B.

⁶ No schedule was accepted for analysis if expenditures plus the net surplus or minus the net deficit differed from income by more than a given margin. (See National Resources Committee, *Consumer Expenditures in the United States, Estimates for 1935-36*, Washington, 1939, p. 108.)

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Table 35. - Average Net Surplus or Deficit and Per Cent of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities with a Deficit, by Income and Color, 1935-36

Income	Georgia-Mississippi counties				North Carolina-South Carolina counties				34 southern villages	
	Farm operators		Sharecroppers		Farm operators		Sharecroppers		Negro	White
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White		
<u>Average net surplus or deficit (-)</u>										
All incomes	\$47	\$281	\$ 5	-\$22	\$44	\$208	\$45	\$54	-\$3	\$126
Less than \$500	-17	-58	-5	-28	-59	-128	-11	-31	-11	-51
\$500-\$999	50	-15	28	-17	37	-42	68	7	3	-36
\$1,000-\$1,499	255	93	-	-	176	35	161	112	48	15
\$1,500-\$1,999	-	336	-	-	(288)	178	-	239	-	63
\$2,000-\$2,999	-	616	-	-	-	431	-	-	-	168
\$3,000 or more	-	2,480	-	-	-	1,476	-	-	-	101
<u>Per cent of families having a deficit</u>										
All incomes	30	32	30	48	37	34	29	33	38	32
Less than \$500	43	57	34	56	64	75	46	60	41	46
\$500-\$999	24	38	21	43	31	50	20	35	33	39
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	28	-	-	13	31	12	22	31	37
\$1,500-\$1,999	-	12	-	-	(13)	24	-	13	-	32
\$2,000-\$2,999	-	15	-	-	-	15	-	-	-	27
\$3,000 or more	-	5	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	8

Table 35. - Average Net Surplus or Deficit and Per Cent of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities with a Deficit, by Income and Color, 1935-36 (cont.)

Income	Four small southern cities ^a		Columbia, S.C., and Mobile, Ala.		Atlanta, Ga.		Columbus, Ohio		New York, N.Y.	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
<u>Average net surplus or deficit (-)</u>										
All incomes	\$ 4	\$81	\$17	\$189	\$37	\$146	\$55	\$196	\$11	\$59
Less than \$500	-8	-46	-11	-132	-42	-	-67	-	-	-
\$500-\$999	-2	-29	18	-26	13	-60	-17	-60	-56	-252
\$1,000-\$1,499	81	-21	33	-7	69	-40	97	-13	-13	-90
\$1,500-\$2,249	(-61)	58	298	43	234	14	186	82	28	-30
\$2,250-\$2,999	-	170	(574)	213	523	169	506	264	170	57
\$3,000 or more	-	806	-	1,066	(1,095)	876	-	909	(394)	369
<u>Per cent of families having a deficit</u>										
All incomes	32	35	24	30	28	36	29	28	33	34
Less than \$500	39	61	31	72	45	-	61	-	-	-
\$500-\$999	26	39	20	41	27	51	43	46	44	62
\$1,000-\$1,499	23	46	21	34	18	46	14	38	37	42
\$1,500-\$2,249	(40)	30	7	31	16	38	10	27	29	36
\$2,250-\$2,999	-	25	(12)	19	9	31	17	21	11	28
\$3,000 or more	-	11	-	11	(0)	14	-	7	(22)	26

^a Albany, Ga.; Gastonia, N.C.; Sumter, S.C.; and Griffin, Ga.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 10 to 25 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletins No. 643, 644, and 647, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Tables 1 and 1-A; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 396, Tables 39 and 40, and Miscellaneous Publication No. 465, Table 33.

tures. This mainly reflects the much lower income level of Negro than white families but also, to a lesser extent, the influence on the average figures of the large savings of the comparatively few wealthy white families.

While Negroes as a group generally had much smaller surpluses than whites, the situation at comparable income levels was quite different. With few exceptions, at the lower income levels Negro families had smaller average net deficits than white families, and they achieved surpluses when whites ended the year with deficits. At the higher income levels Negro families made considerably larger savings, on the average, than white families. Furthermore, the proportions of families at given income levels that ended the year with deficits were lower among Negroes than whites. In the various communities the proportions of all families regardless of income having deficits were generally no higher among Negroes than whites and in some cases were considerably lower.

The favorable balance-sheet showing of Negro as compared with white families with similar incomes was also found when families of similar type were compared (Table 36). In the same income groups Negro families usually had smaller deficits and larger surpluses than white families of the same type.

The more successful balancing of Negro than white budgets suggests that Negroes have less access to credit than white families. In addition, there may be quite a number of other factors, either operating independently or influencing the credit rating of families. In any given income group white families are more likely than Negro families to have "seen better days." Such families may have savings to draw upon or they may not have become adjusted to their more limited incomes. In a given income group, also, white families probably include a large proportion which have reason to anticipate higher earnings in the future and hence find it easier than Negro families to obtain credit and less necessary to keep their expenditures within their current incomes. The fact that Negroes have much less chance of economic advancement may also have a certain significance. It may mean that Negro families in low income brackets are more heterogeneous than whites in that they include a larger proportion of families whose general economic ability exceeds their actual economic position.

Such explanations, however, are only hypothetical. They are offered in order to show that the findings on this point in the Consumer Purchases Study are not necessarily as unreasonable as one would at first be inclined to believe. One may admit that the Con-

sumer Purchases Study, like many similar investigations, could be characterized by an underrepresentation of particularly improvident families and that such a limitation possibly could be more significant in regard to Negroes than whites. Yet even in that case it appears justified to conclude that the general impressions regarding Negro improvidence and extravagance are greatly exaggerated and that the Negro population includes a substantial number of families which balance their budgets better than the average white family of corresponding means.⁷

Table 36.—Average Net Surplus or Deficit of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Cities, by Color, Income, and Family Type, *a/* 1935-36

City and color	Income and family type					
	\$500-\$999			\$1,000-\$1,499		
	I	II-III	IV-V	I	II-III	IV-V
Columbia, S.C., and Mobile, Ala.						
Negro	\$28	\$4	\$16	\$6	\$75	\$31
White	6	-22	-59	49	-27	-30
Atlanta, Ga.						
Negro	30	21	-4	77	89	75
White	(-81)	-17	-99	-71	-25	-31
Columbus, Ohio						
Negro	-11	-14	-31	104	82	94
White	-88	-32	-72	16	-12	-60

a/ For a description of family types, see p. 80

Note: The figure in parentheses is based on 22 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletins No. 644 and 647, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Table 1.

DISTRIBUTION OF EXPENDITURES BY MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CONSUMPTION

Since the average total expenditures of Negroes are smaller than those of whites with similar incomes, the apportionment of expendi-

⁷ The individual variations are large as suggested by the following data on money value of current family living for native-born nonrelief normal families in Atlanta with incomes of \$1,000-\$1,249 in 1935-36.

Color	Per cent distribution, by money value of current family living					
	Total	Less than \$1,000	\$1,000-\$1,199	\$1,200-\$1,399	\$1,400-\$1,599	\$1,600 or more
Negro.....	100	21	47	28	4	*
White.....	100	13	45	24	12	6

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 647, Vol. II, p. 95.

tures among various goods and services by Negro and white families in given income groups is not strictly comparable. In other words, on the basis of available tabulations it is impossible to answer adequately the question: To what extent do Negro and white families differ in their manner of spending a certain amount of money for consumption purposes? In order to get exact information on this point, the families would have to be classified by total expenditures rather than by income. Nevertheless, it is also important to determine the changes which occur in consumption with increases in income and whether they are similar in the case of whites and Negroes.

Data for selected communities on the money value⁸ of five major categories of goods and services by race, income, and family type⁹ give an over-all view of the consumption of different groups of families during 1935-36 (Table 37). The expenditures of Negro and white families can be considered regardless of income in order to obtain a rough measure of the levels of living of the two groups.

Food consistently represented the largest single category in the total value of family living: for Negro farm operator families and for Negro and white sharecropper families in Georgia and Mississippi, as much as 60 per cent; for white farm operator families, 45 per cent; for Negro families in southern villages, 43 per cent; for Negro families in Atlanta and New York, 34 per cent; and for white families in Atlanta, New York, and the southern villages, 28 to 32 per cent. The difference between white and Negro families thus appears to have been comparatively insignificant in large cities but pronounced in farm areas.

The proportion of the income that is spent for food is a useful index of the level of living. A figure of 60 per cent is extremely high, usually indicating poor living conditions. Not only was the general average for Negro farm families approximately 60 per cent

⁸ Includes money expenditures plus the money value of goods and services received without direct money expense.

⁹ The same family-type classification was used for the income and the expenditure data in the Consumer Purchases Study, but certain types were combined for the expenditure data in most of the communities and community groups for which data on Negro families were available. These combined groups were much less satisfactory than the original ones. Two of them were rather heterogeneous.

<i>Family type</i>	<i>Total members</i>	<i>Number of persons 16 years of age and over</i>	<i>Number of children under 16 years of age</i>
I	2	2	0
II-III.....	3-4	2	1-2
IV-V.....	3-6	3-5	0-3
VI-VII.....	5-8	2-7	1-6

Table 37. - Total Expenditures a/by Major Categories of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Family Type, b/Income, and Color, 1935-36

Community or family type	Negro				White							
	Total	Food	Housing	Household operation and furnishings	Clothing and Personal care	Other	Total	Food	Housing	Household operation and furnishings	Clothing and Personal care	Other
Georgia-Mississippi farm operators												
All groups	\$582	\$352	\$30	\$55	\$67	\$78	\$1,145	\$511	\$103	\$131	\$145	\$255
Family type I	477	282	32	48	46	69	963	402	105	120	101	235
II-III	550	331	29	55	64	71	1,064	482	88	130	127	237
IV-V	647	381	32	58	84	92	1,345	575	125	153	182	311
VI-VII	625	421	24	59	62	59	936	531	58	79	123	145
Income group												
Less than \$500	389	245	21	41	38	44	467	279	34	48	49	57
\$500-\$999	665	409	34	60	78	84	759	426	53	72	88	120
\$1,000-\$1,499	908	490	46	81	126	166	1,151	585	84	119	143	220
\$1,500-\$1,999	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,381	620	112	155	193	301
\$2,000-\$2,999	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,889	668	197	237	251	536
\$3,000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,421	924	441	494	458	1,104
Georgia-Mississippi sharecroppers												
All groups	418	256	19	43	48	52	588	369	32	58	67	62
Family type I	324	199	17	38	33	37	503	304	30	61	47	61
II-III	380	225	18	42	45	50	534	328	29	56	60	61
IV-V	478	290	21	46	58	63	660	414	36	59	83	68
VI-VII	478	315	21	50	45	47	646	434	32	57	68	55
Income group												
Less than \$500	324	198	17	36	36	37	424	266	24	44	48	42
\$500-\$999	632	390	26	59	73	84	707	443	38	69	81	76

Table 37. - Total Expenditures a/ by Major Categories of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Family Type, b/ Income, and Color, 1935-36 (continued)

Community or income, and family type	Negro					White				
	Total Food	Housing c/	Household clothing operation and furnishings	Personal and care	Other	Total Food	Housing c/	Household clothing operation and furnishings	Personal and care	Other
34 southern villages										
All groups	\$ 550 235	\$ 72	\$ 71	\$ 78	\$ 94	\$1,586 470	\$208	\$279	\$220	\$ 409
Family type I	536 219	74	76	70	98	1,427 368	210	273	179	397
II-III	511 226	62	66	73	84	1,519 440	189	287	207	396
IV-V	612 264	80	77	92	99	1,807 552	241	289	265	460
VI-VII	531 234	68	62	79	88	1,440 529	157	238	211	305
Income group										
Less than \$500	386 184	52	48	51	51	498 205	76	82	64	71
\$500-\$999	702 289	87	91	100	135	830 316	110	138	114	152
\$1,000-\$1,499	1,177 380	153	187	195	252	1,280 425	167	229	174	285
\$1,500-\$1,999	-	-	-	-	-	1,691 491	220	312	232	435
\$2,000-\$2,999	-	-	-	-	-	2,267 607	300	402	312	645
\$3,000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	3,310 786	423	561	486	1,054
Atlanta, Ga.										
All groups	856 293	153	123	108	179	2,064 594	341	338	252	549
Family type I	784 253	144	118	93	176	1,957 495	355	314	225	568
II-III	787 273	146	121	91	156	1,936 559	312	330	235	499
IV-V	946 321	166	130	129	200	2,268 677	389	365	286	581
VI-VII	904 355	149	118	120	162	-	-	-	-	-
Income group										
Less than \$500	452 187	109	64	34	58	-	-	-	-	-
\$500-\$999	769 282	137	109	93	148	884 353	146	152	93	140
\$1,000-\$1,499	1,200 372	199	175	172	282	1,324 437	223	225	159	280
\$1,500-\$2,499	1,682 460	277	244	248	453	1,861 561	312	309	220	469
\$2,500-\$2,999	1,988 511	333	316	296	532	2,426 673	398	379	307	669
\$3,000 or more	(3,056) (537)	(378)	(468)	(528)	(1,045)	4,025 928	656	662	504	1,275

Table 37. - Total Expenditures a/by Major Categories of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Family Type, b/Income, and Color, 1935-36 (continued)

Community or community group, income, and family type	Negro					White				
	Total Food	Housing c/	Household operation and furnishings	Clothing and Personal care	Other	Total Food	Housing c/	Household operation and furnishings	Clothing and Personal care	Other
New York, N.Y.										
All groups	\$1,498	\$504	\$405	\$167	\$252	\$2,567	\$819	\$309	\$280	\$600
Family type I	1,434	462	390	157	256	2,392	691	561	259	606
II-III	1,407	504	377	158	202	2,441	811	536	259	521
IV-V	1,760	612	460	204	301	2,861	945	583	325	692
Income group										
\$500-\$999	985	383	300	78	112	1,108	461	318	81	125
\$1,000-\$1,499	1,301	459	367	134	193	1,380	544	354	116	209
\$1,500-\$2,249	1,810	601	451	232	314	1,929	708	455	192	361
\$2,250-\$2,999	2,393	700	594	295	563	2,574	856	556	292	576
\$3,000 or more	t	t	t	t	t	4,832	1,248	941	581	1,423

t Fewer than 10 cases.

a/ Money and nonmoney combined.

b/ For a description of family types, see p.

c/ Includes the rent contracted for by renting families and the rental value of owned homes. The value of fuel, light, and refrigeration is included when furnished by the landlord and included in the rental rates.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 10 to 25 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletins No. 643 and 647, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Tables 2,

3, and 4; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 396, Tables 38,

40, 50, and 51, Miscellaneous Publication No. 466, Tables 35, 40, and 46, and unpublished data.

but also the averages for those in different family-type groups at the two income levels below \$1,000, which included the great majority of all Negro farm families, were equally high. This was due not only to the fact that outlays for goods and services other than food were low but also to the fact that the absolute value of the food consumed by Negro farm families was rather high compared with corresponding figures for Negro families in Atlanta and the southern villages. While this is in part a result of the larger size of farm than nonfarm families, the differences appear significant even when families of similar size are compared.

Next in importance to food were the expenditures for housing, which accounted for 27 per cent of the total for Negro families in New York and 22 per cent for white families. The figure for Atlanta was 17 to 18 per cent for both Negroes and whites, and in the southern villages a common average of 13 per cent was reported. The housing data for farms were based on rather loose estimates, but housing was usually an insignificant item. Household operation and furnishings usually accounted for somewhat over 10 per cent of the expenditures but in some cases for considerably more, particularly among whites in Atlanta and in southern villages. More than a tenth of the family budget was spent for clothing and personal care.

While race differences in the relative importance of household operation and furnishings and clothing and personal care were not large, expenditures for the remaining items (including transportation, medical care, recreation, gifts, etc.) together absorbed a considerably larger share of the budgets of white than Negro families except in the case of sharecroppers. Negro families in Atlanta, for example, devoted only 21 per cent of their total expenditures to such items, while whites in the same city used 27 per cent. In absolute amounts the expenditures were consistently lower for Negroes than for whites. The average for Negro sharecroppers was only \$52.

While differences in the general level of living of Negro and white families are shown clearly by average expenditures, the picture is not complete without some consideration of the influence of family size and family income on expenditures. Food expenditures per family generally increased with increases in family size,¹⁰ but the

¹⁰ If it were possible to analyze the relationship between food expenditures per family and varying numbers of children and of adults, respectively, without regard to family income, significant differences would probably appear. Some confirmation of this is provided by the data in Table 37 for southern village families. In the case both of Negroes and of whites, average food expenditures were somewhat higher for families containing three to six members, at least three of whom were adults

increases were not proportionate.¹¹ The situation was especially serious among Negro families in southern villages.¹² Corresponding white families showed larger gains in food expenditures per family with increasing family size.¹³ The family-type data for Atlanta and New York showed a similar race differential. Apparently the concentration of Negro families in the lower income groups means that they do not have as much leeway as white families when it comes to adjusting food consumption to family size.

Large Negro families in income groups which were typical for the nonrelief Negro population had considerably lower food expenditures than small white families at the income levels typical for nonrelief whites. For example, Negro families in Atlanta belonging to types VI-VII (average number of persons, 6.2) and having an income of \$500-\$999 had a food expenditure of \$334, whereas white two-person families with incomes of \$1,500-\$2,249 spent \$459.

The data leave no doubt that there is room for a huge expansion

(types IV and V), than for families with five to eight members but relatively few adults (types VI and VII).

¹¹ Figures on food expenditures per equivalent adult show with greater accuracy than per person food figures the effect of family composition on food consumption. This effect is illustrated by the following figures which show the average money expenditures for food per meal per equivalent adult among nonrelief Negro families at different income levels in Atlanta:

Normal families by number of adults and children	Average money expenditure per meal per equivalent adult, by income					
	\$250- \$499	\$500- \$749	\$750- \$999	\$1,000- \$1,249	\$1,250- \$1,499	\$1,500- \$2,249
Families consisting of 2 adults and no others.....	\$.065	\$.091	\$.107	\$.119	\$.115	\$.164
1 child under 16.....	.071	.076	.073	.096	.107	.143
2 children under 16.....	.039	.058	.065	.087	.104	.113
3-4 children under 16.....	.034	.054	.062	.073	.080	—
Families consisting of 3 adults and 1 or no others.....	.042	.064	.064	.075	.088	.107
1 child under 16 and 1-2 others..	.029	.039	.061	.062	.071	.086
Families consisting of 7-8 members.	.032	.039	.041	.047	.053	.073

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 647, Vol. II, p. 32.

¹² U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 396, Tables 51 and 55.

Normal families containing	Annual food expenditures per family		Annual food expenditures per person		Weekly food expenditures per person	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Two members.....	\$218	\$368	\$109	\$184	\$2.10	\$3.54
5 to 8 members						
(including 1 to 6 children).....	234	529	38	87	0.73	1.67

in American food consumption. Even though high-income families allot a much smaller proportion of their total expenditures to food than low-income families, they spend so much more in absolute amounts that any device to overcome the economic restrictions on food consumption by the poorer families would add tremendously to the market for foodstuffs. It is clear, also, that large families constitute a particularly significant potential market.

Expenditures for housing, like those for food, showed a fairly clear tendency to increase with income, but again the proportion of the total spent in this way, at least in nonfarm areas, was highest among families in the low income groups. There was no consistent decline, however, at succeeding income levels. It is of great significance, moreover, that there was little change in the average expenditures for housing with the size of the family. In some cases large families actually spent less, on the average, for housing than small families. Consequently, the desirability of housing accommodations was inversely related to family size, a point discussed more extensively in the chapter on housing.

Expenditures for household operation, furnishings, and equipment increased at about the same rate as income so that the proportion of the total budget reserved for them showed only small variations with income. Outlays for clothing and personal care, on the other hand, tended to rise proportionately at succeeding income levels, particularly in the case of urban Negroes. Family size did not greatly influence these expenditures. This, of course, means that large families were much worse off than small ones in terms of the adequacy of these items.

In combination, the remaining items, which included not only such luxuries as recreation and gifts but also such essentials as transportation and medical care, showed wide variations with income. In each of the selected communities families with incomes of \$3,000 or more allotted nearly one-third of their budgets to such items, while families with incomes of less than \$1,000 used less than one-fifth of their budgets for them. Furthermore, since food, and in some cases housing, absorbed a greater share of the total expenditures of large than small families, proportionately less remained as family size increased to be spent for such categories as medical care, transportation, and recreation.

Chapter VII

FOOD CONSUMPTION

The relative importance of food in the expenditures of Negro and white families has been analyzed in the preceding chapter. The purpose here is to indicate the actual food consumption of Negroes and whites and to evaluate its adequacy. Information concerning the value and quantity of foods consumed is available both from the Consumer Purchases Study and from the survey of the money disbursements of wage earners and clerical workers.¹

Before analyzing the details of food consumption, it is desirable to consider a question of special importance for the interpretation of the detailed data; namely, the proportion of food provided from home gardens or received as gifts or in payment for services by Negro and white families at different income levels in selected communities. The valuation of food obtained without money expense is subject to considerable error, as was pointed out in the income chapter, but especial care was exercised in the Consumer Purchases Study to avoid underestimation. The amount of home-produced food is of very real importance for farm families. Home production is valuable in reducing cash expenditures and also because the more food families grow for their own consumption the more likely they

¹ While the data on food presented in the preceding chapter represented the total expenditures (money and nonmoney) for food during an entire year, the information from the Consumer Purchases Study on the consumption of different food items was obtained from a smaller sample of families and relates to food consumed at home during one week in the spring, summer, or fall season. The data for rural families cover one week between March and November, while those for urban families relate to the period May through August. Data for southern urban families were also obtained for the period September through November, but the number of schedules for Negro families was too small to warrant inclusion. The data on which the nutritional analysis was based likewise relate to the food consumption at home during one week. Since the data on the values and quantities of various foods consumed do not cover the winter months, and food consumption differs somewhat from season to season, caution must be exercised in drawing general conclusions as to dietary habits.

Table 38.- Proportion of All Family Food Obtained without Direct Money Expenditure by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Color, 1935-36

Community or community group	Per cent of all family food obtained without direct money expenditure	
	Negro	White
Georgia-Mississippi counties		
Farm operators	65.9	69.9
Sharecroppers	60.9	72.1
34 southern villages	25.1	16.4
Atlanta, Ga.	14.7	2.7
New York, N. Y.	7.7	2.0

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Table 3; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 396, Table 55, and Miscellaneous Publication No. 405, Table 42.

are to have nutritionally adequate diets.² Table 38 shows that the southern farm families in the sample produced as much as two-thirds or even more of the value of their home consumption on their own farms. In spite of that, however, Negro farm families had to devote from 42 to 48 per cent and white farm families from 24 to 41 per cent of their cash expenditures for food (Table 39). Moreover, since farm laborers as well as farm operators and sharecroppers with less than one year's residence on the farm were omitted from the sample, the proportion of homegrown food was probably greatly exaggerated, particularly for Negroes and whites in low income groups.³

² Hazel K. Stiebeling and Callie Mae Coons, "Present-day Diets in the United States," *Food and Life, Yearbook of Agriculture, 1939*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, pp. 297-302.

³ Another problem concerns expenditures for food away from home. The data on consumption of specific foods relate only to food consumed at home or at least prepared at home. Expenditures for food away from home were sometimes quite significant in white families but in most cases unimportant in Negro households, as the following mean figures indicate:

Color	Georgia-Mississippi counties		34 southern villages	Atlanta, Ga.	New York, N. Y.
	Farm operators	Sharecroppers			
Negro	\$ 5	\$3	\$10	\$12	\$ 55
White	\$17	\$2	\$40	\$91	\$161

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Table 3; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 396, Table 55, and Miscellaneous Publication No. 405, Table 42.

Table 39. - Money Expenditure for Food as a Per Cent of Total Money Expenditures by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Georgia and Mississippi Counties, by Tenure, Color, and Income, 1935-36

Tenure and color	Per cent of money expenditures spent for food, by income									
	All incomes	Less than \$500	\$500-\$999	\$1,000-\$1,499	\$1,500-\$1,999	\$2,000-\$2,999	\$3,000 or more			
Farm operators										
Negro	42.4	48.6	42.1	35.1	-	-	-			
White	23.5	34.4	29.2	26.0	24.5	19.9	17.7			
Sharecroppers										
Negro	47.6	52.4	43.5	-	-	-	-			
White	40.7	45.5	38.5	-	-	-	-			

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 405, Table 42.

EXPENDITURES FOR VARIOUS FOODSTUFFS

Data on the average value of different types of food consumed at home during one week by nonrelief normal families in different types of communities (Table 40) indicate that Negro families in most cases spent about the same amounts as white families of the same income class for protein foods (meats, sea food, eggs), sugar, flour, grains, and cereals.⁴ Their expenditures for butter and other fats were in most cases somewhat below those of white families of similar means; and they were much lower for such important protective foodstuffs as milk, cream, cheese, vegetables, and fruits. Also expenditures by Negro families for baked goods were small compared with those in white homes of the corresponding income class.

The general differences for all income groups combined were, of course, much greater than those at given income levels. These general differences probably were even larger in most cases than appear from the data on all families combined and on various family types.⁵ It is possible to determine in which groups of food expendi-

⁴ These comparisons do not show how Negroes and whites apportion a given total food expenditure among various items, for the total food expenditure was smaller for Negroes than for whites in each income group. The following figures on total food expenditure per week indicate the size of this difference according to the data on which Table 40 is based:*

Community group	Income					
	Less than \$500	\$500-\$999	\$1,000-\$1,499	\$1,500-\$1,999	\$2,000-\$2,999	\$3,000 or more
Southern farm counties						
Negro farm operators and sharecroppers.....	\$4.22	\$5.96	\$7.77	(\$ 8.17)	—	—
White farm operators.....	6.01	7.88	9.78	10.87	\$11.23	\$13.29
White sharecroppers.....	5.57	7.20	8.88	9.55	—	—
34 southern villages						
Negro.....	3.26	5.05	6.64	—	—	—
White.....	5.12	6.33	8.11	9.07	10.47	12.95
Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga.....						
Negro.....	3.11	4.64	6.34	7.21	8.44	(11.25)
White.....	—	6.29	7.68	9.20	10.16	13.85

* The figures include the value of miscellaneous items omitted in Table 40. Note: The figures in parentheses are based on 10 to 25 cases.

⁵ This is so because, as previously stated, relief families, farm laborers, and farmers who had moved during the year were excluded. In some cases the effects of the omissions were counteracted by the fact that low-income white and high-income Negro families were omitted from this part of the study.

Table 40. - Average Value of Major Food Groups Consumed at Home during One Week by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Color Family Type ^a and Income, 1936 ^b

Food group, community group, and color	All groups	Family type					Income					\$2,000-\$2,999	\$5,000 or more
		I	II-III			IV-V	VI-VII	Less than \$500	\$500-\$999	\$1,000-\$1,499	\$1,500-\$1,999		
Number of families													
Southern farm counties ^a													
Negro farm operators and sharecroppers	1,564	266	357	602	339	730	657	149	20	-	-	-	-
White farm operators	2,350	332	511	1,016	439	279	916	523	270	222	140	-	-
White sharecroppers	878	140	292	276	170	236	462	134	46	-	-	-	-
34 southern villages													
Negro	632	219	170	161	72	372	210	30	-	-	-	-	-
White	1,275	271	455	416	131	59	296	341	236	226	113	-	-
Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga.													
Negro	1,082	319	284	374	105	259	468	257	42	44	12	-	-
White	1,710	346	668	696	-	-	149	306	439	543	271	-	-
Meats, seafood, eggs													
Southern farm counties ^a													
Negro farm operators and sharecroppers	\$1.57	\$1.21	\$1.36	\$1.76	\$1.77	\$1.12	\$1.81	\$2.51	\$(2.72)	-	-	-	-
White farm operators	2.48	1.98	2.16	2.66	2.64	1.39	1.94	2.66	3.25	\$3.50	\$4.37	-	-
White sharecroppers	1.99	1.69	1.90	2.24	2.07	1.22	1.95	3.06	3.45	-	-	-	-
34 southern villages													
Negro	1.32	1.25	1.27	1.39	1.47	.99	1.65	2.35	-	-	-	-	-
White	2.65	2.13	2.49	3.10	2.89	1.56	1.76	2.45	2.88	3.36	4.45	-	-
Columbia, S.C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga.													
Negro	1.74	1.54	1.59	1.95	2.10	1.10	1.74	2.39	2.66	3.27	(4.71)	-	-
White	3.01	2.56	2.63	3.49	-	-	1.69	2.21	2.69	3.26	4.68	-	-
Milk, cream, cheese, icecream													
Southern farm counties ^a													
Negro farm operators and sharecroppers	0.80	0.54	0.65	0.90	0.95	0.60	0.65	1.32	(1.67)	-	-	-	-
White farm operators	1.99	1.27	1.64	2.09	2.64	1.31	1.62	2.22	2.39	2.41	2.41	-	-
White sharecroppers	1.34	.87	1.10	1.63	1.59	1.11	1.37	1.52	1.36	-	-	-	-
34 southern villages													
Negro36	.33	.34	.41	.45	.24	.53	.62	-	-	-	-	-

Table 40. - Average Value of Major Food Groups Consumed at Home during One Week by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Color, Family Type, *B*, and Income, 1936 *D*/ (continued)

Food group, community group, and color	All groups	Family type				1935 \$500	\$500- \$999	\$1,000- \$1,499	\$1,500- \$1,999	\$2,000- \$2,999	\$3,000 or more
		I	II-III	IV-V	VI-VIII						
White, Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala. and Atlanta, Ga.	\$1.26	\$0.84	\$1.20	\$1.45	\$1.73	\$1.77	\$0.94	\$1.21	\$1.29	\$1.57	\$3.00
Negro	.39	.32	.40	.43	.41	.21	.39	.59	.73	1.03	(1.40)
White	1.37	1.00	1.49	1.52	-	-	.73	1.15	1.33	1.48	2.04
<u>Butter, lard and other fatty foods</u>											
<u>Southern farm counties</u>											
Negro farm operators and sharecroppers	0.68	0.53	0.61	0.76	0.74	0.55	0.77	0.87	(0.96)	-	-
White farm operators	1.01	.76	.91	1.09	1.14	.77	.98	1.02	1.14	1.06	1.24
White sharecroppers	.87	.67	.74	1.03	1.01	.75	.92	.87	.97	-	-
<u>34 southern villages</u>											
Negro	.49	.42	.49	.50	.53	.41	.56	.65	-	-	-
White	.86	.64	.80	.86	1.12	.61	.73	.83	.89	.96	1.08
Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga.	.84	.47	.51	.61	.63	.40	.55	.70	.69	.84	(1.01)
Negro	.77	.63	.74	.90	-	-	.58	.67	.74	.80	1.04
<u>Vegetables, fruits and nuts</u>											
<u>Southern farm counties</u>											
Negro farm operators and sharecroppers	0.77	0.56	0.69	0.85	0.90	0.62	0.84	1.14	(1.01)	-	-
White farm operators	1.43	.99	1.29	1.61	1.84	.95	1.22	1.55	1.71	1.76	2.31
White sharecroppers	1.09	.86	1.02	1.19	1.24	.90	1.10	1.30	1.35	-	-
<u>34 southern villages</u>											
Negro	.64	.61	.68	.66	.66	.46	.83	1.25	-	-	-
White	1.76	1.48	1.69	1.94	1.95	.96	1.18	1.64	1.89	2.13	2.90
Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala. and Atlanta, Ga.	.62	.67	.76	.92	1.05	.52	.79	1.21	1.44	1.56	(2.33)
Negro	2.12	1.74	2.15	2.38	-	-	1.36	1.64	2.03	2.30	3.22

Table 40. - Average Value of Major Food Groups Consumed at Home during One week by Native-born, nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Color, Family Type, S, and Income, 1936 S/ (continued)

Food group, community group, and color	All groups	Family type				VI-VIII	Less than \$500		Income			
		I	II-III	IV-V			\$500	\$500-\$999	\$1,000-\$1,499	\$1,500-\$1,999	\$2,000-\$2,999	\$3,000 or more
Baked goods												
Southern farm counties												
Negro farm operators and sharecroppers	\$0.04	\$0.05	\$0.04	\$0.05	\$0.03	\$0.03	\$0.05	\$0.06	\$(0.06)	-	-	-
White farm operators15	.12	.16	.16	.14	.14	.06	.07	.16	.19	0.26	0.41
White sharecroppers09	.07	.09	.10	.12	.12	.05	.06	.17	.23	-	-
34 southern villages												
Negro12	.13	.11	.12	.10	.10	.07	.17	.27	-	-	-
White44	.56	.45	.50	.46	.46	.16	.27	.43	.49	.56	.72
Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga.												
Negro19	.18	.18	.21	.14	.14	.12	.16	.27	.35	.50	(.49)
White75	.61	.76	.85	-	-	-	.50	.67	.77	.90	.94
Flour, cereals, and other grain products												
Southern farm counties												
Negro farm operators and sharecroppers	0.97	0.65	0.79	1.02	1.31	1.31	0.86	1.03	1.11	(1.08)	-	-
White farm operators	1.06	.72	.91	1.10	1.42	.89	1.03	1.03	1.12	1.14	1.15	1.12
White sharecroppers99	.67	.81	1.14	1.31	1.31	.90	1.01	1.06	1.10	-	-
34 southern villages												
Negro71	.55	.71	.76	1.05	.69	.69	.73	.80	-	-	-
White78	.46	.65	.61	1.13	.67	.67	.72	.71	.71	.72	.73
Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga.												
Negro53	.39	.51	.61	.90	.44	.44	.55	.62	.58	.82	(.85)
White89	.36	.52	.66	-	-	-	.65	.50	.51	.63	.56
Sugar and other sweets												
Southern farm counties												
Negro farm operators and sharecroppers	0.37	0.27	0.33	0.39	0.40	0.28	0.41	0.47	(0.47)	-	-	-
White farm operators69	.42	.53	.62	.69	.40	.53	.63	.63	0.68	0.77	-
White sharecroppers67	.57	.45	.51	.57	.41	.49	.51	.51	-	-	-
34 southern villages												
Negro28	.26	.28	.32	.27	.24	.33	.39	.39	-	-	-
White43	.35	.39	.49	.60	.32	.36	.43	.44	.46	.51	-
Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga.												
Negro25	.20	.26	.26	.34	.20	.26	.30	.30	.32	(.34)	(.34)
White36	.26	.36	.41	-	-	-	.30	.35	.37	.36	.43

- a/ For a description of family types, see p. 80
- b/ The table includes expenditures for all foods except a miscellaneous item, the value of which ranged from \$0.17 for Negro farm families to \$0.60 for white families in the three southern cities.
- c/ Data for Negro farm operators and sharecroppers from 13 counties in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi; for white farm operators from 22 counties in the four states; and for white sharecroppers from 20 counties in the four states.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 10 to 25 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Table 4; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 405, Table 53, and Miscellaneous Publication No. 452, Tables 35.

tures the general race differentials were particularly large. Except for baked goods the milk and cheese group and the fruit and vegetable group showed the most pronounced differences. This was partly because Negro expenditures were lower already at given income levels but also because the outlays for these foods, at least in urban areas, varied markedly with income. Large Negro families (types VI-VII) in the three southern cities spent less than one-half as much for milk, cheese, etc. (\$0.41), as white two-person families (\$1.00), and there was a similar difference in regard to fruits and vegetables (\$1.05 and \$1.74, respectively). The outlays of Negro families for these foods in some instances showed a remarkably small variation with family size. This was particularly true in the case of the Negro village families' expenditures for vegetables and fruits, which were only a few cents higher for large than small household units. Expenditures for meats, sea food, and eggs showed a substantial, although somewhat less spectacular, race differential. The amounts spent on fats, sugar, and other sweets, on the other hand, which are much less dependent on income, showed a smaller general difference, and there was no consistent race difference at all in regard to flour, cereals, and other grain products.

QUANTITIES OF VARIOUS FOODSTUFFS CONSUMED

Quantities of various foods consumed provide a somewhat better basis for comparing the dietary habits of Negroes and whites than does the value of such foods. More flour, meal, sugar, poultry, and fresh fish were consumed during the survey period by Negro than white families at each income level in Atlanta, Columbia, and Mobile (Table 41). Negroes generally consumed about the same amount of butter, less of other table fats, and more lard and lard compounds, which are less expensive than other fats. They consumed fresh pork to a somewhat greater extent and cured pork of various sorts in about the same measure but slightly less beef than whites. Roughly the same amount of cabbage was used by urban families in each racial group, but Negroes consumed substantially less of the other vegetables shown. This was particularly true in regard to tomatoes, one of the main sources of vitamin C. Another significant example of lesser consumption among Negroes was white potatoes. On the other hand, Negroes consumed greater quantities of sweet potatoes than whites but not enough to make up for the large difference in regard to white potatoes. Since most vegetables were in season during the months covered by the survey, and hence obtainable at less expense

Table 41. - Average Quantity of Specified Foods Consumed at Home during One Week, May-August, 1936, by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga., by Income and Color

Food category	Income											
	All incomes		Less than \$500		\$500-999		\$1,000-\$1,499		\$1,500-\$1,999		\$2,000-\$2,999	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Number of families in sample	1,082	1,710	259	149	458	149	257	308	42	439	44	543
Beef	1.7	2.8	1.3	1.7	1.8	1.9	2.3	2.5	2.7	2.7	3.1	4.0
(lbs.)												
Pork: fresh	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.9	0.6	0.9	0.5	0.9	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.6
(lbs.)												
bacon	0.5	1.0	0.3	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.4
(lbs.)												
ham	0.2	0.5	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.9
(lbs.)												
salt-side	1.1	0.8	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.2	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.6
(lbs.)												
Poultry	1.1	1.5	0.5	1.1	0.6	1.6	0.8	2.9	1.4	2.6	1.6	2.9
(lbs.)												
Fresh fish	1.4	0.6	1.2	1.5	0.5	1.7	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.6	0.6	0.9
(lbs.)												
Eggs	0.8	2.0	0.5	0.4	0.9	2.5	1.6	4.9	2.4	6.1	3.8	5.7
(doz.)												
Milk: whole fresh	1.0	5.8	0.4	0.9	1.5	1.7	1.4	2.2	1.6	1.8	0.8	1.8
(qts.)												
butter-milk	1.3	1.9	0.9	1.5	1.7	1.4	2.2	2.0	1.4	1.8	1.4	1.4
(cans)												
Butter	0.8	1.6	0.5	0.8	1.9	1.2	2.0	1.4	1.8	1.4	1.4	1.6
(lbs.)												
Other table fats	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.7	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.1
(lbs.)												
Lard and lard compounds	2.1	1.4	1.6	2.2	1.5	2.1	1.5	1.8	1.4	1.8	1.3	2.8
(lbs.)												
Potatoes: white	2.1	4.3	1.5	2.1	4.4	2.6	4.3	2.8	4.2	2.7	4.2	4.7
(lbs.)												
Tomatoes: sweet	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.3
(lbs.)												
Tomatoes: fresh	0.7	2.4	0.4	0.7	1.7	1.1	2.0	1.5	2.4	2.2	2.3	3.5
(cans)												
Tomatoes: canned	0.2	0.8	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.7	0.1	0.6	0.4
(lbs.)												
Cabbage	1.2	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.8	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
(lbs.)												
Snap beans	1.3	2.1	1.0	1.3	1.8	1.6	1.8	1.5	2.2	1.7	2.2	2.8
(lbs.)												
Lettuce	0.2	1.0	*	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.7	1.0	0.9	1.1	1.7
(heads)												
Onions	0.6	0.9	0.6	0.5	1.0	0.7	0.9	0.6	0.9	0.6	0.8	0.9
(lbs.)												
Oranges	0.1	0.5	*	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.3
(doz.)												
Lemons	0.3	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.8	0.6	1.0
(doz.)												
Wheat bread	1.7	5.7	1.1	1.6	4.2	2.2	5.2	3.0	6.0	4.1	5.9	6.4
(lbs.)												
White flour	5.3	4.2	4.3	5.8	5.9	5.8	4.1	3.7	3.8	4.5	4.0	4.3
(lbs.)												
Corn meal	3.3	2.2	3.1	3.4	3.1	3.7	2.5	2.7	2.1	1.9	2.0	1.7
(lbs.)												
Sugar	3.8	4.3	3.1	3.9	3.7	4.3	4.0	4.6	4.3	5.0	4.4	5.1
(lbs.)												

*Less than 0.05.

g/ Including juice.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 12 cases.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Table 5.

than during the late fall and winter, it is probable that average weekly consumption would have been even lower on an annual basis. May to August is not the season for low-priced citrus fruits, but they are available the year around. The exceedingly small quantities used, and the lack of substitutes on a large scale, suggest a serious deficiency in this respect in the diets of both white and Negro urban families in the South. This is much more serious for the latter, however, since they are so heavily concentrated at the lowest income levels where the consumption of these important fruits is negligible.

The consumption of eggs, of whole fresh milk, and of canned milk, even at given income levels, was substantially lower among Negro than white urban families. Buttermilk was used almost as freely by Negroes as by whites at the lower income levels. It is of considerable significance that the relative difference between Negroes and whites in the quantities of eggs and of whole, fresh, and canned milk that were consumed declined substantially with increase in income. This suggests that the failure of Negro urban families at the low income levels to consume these important foods to as great an extent as white urban families with similar incomes was due at least in part to the fact that they had to limit their food expenditures more rigorously than white families, since they were forced to keep their total expenditures closer to their meager incomes.

All of these comparisons apply to corresponding income groups. When the general averages for all income groups combined were compared, the differences were much greater. Whites reported the consumption of nearly six times as much whole fresh milk and twice as much canned milk as Negroes. On the average, white families used more than twice as many eggs, over three times as many tomatoes, five times as many oranges, and over twice as many pounds of white potatoes as Negro families. Negroes used somewhat less butter and other table fats but more lard products. Beef was used in considerably larger quantities by whites than by Negroes. Negroes are thought to be particularly fond of pork and poultry, and at given income levels Negro families were found to consume more of these products, on the average, than white families. The general figures, however, indicate that, while they did use more fresh pork and salt-side, they consumed less bacon, ham, and poultry than white families. On the other hand, Negroes used more than twice as much fresh fish as whites. The consumption of white flour and of corn meal was higher among Negro than white urban families, but consumption of wheat bread was more than three times as high among

the latter as among the former. If two-thirds of the weight of the bread is added to the weight of the flour and corn meal (following the procedure used by Stiebeling),⁶ it appears that the average consumption of these three products was slightly higher for whites than for Negroes. The fact that Negroes consumed more of a number of products, such as fish, fatty foods, flour, and corn meal, than whites indicates that Negroes buy cheaper varieties of foods within given groups or perhaps that they market with greater care.

Among farm families the consumption of milk and potatoes was considerably greater than that reported by urban families in the case of Negroes and whites alike, both in general and at given income levels (Appendix table 27). The relatively generous quantities of milk consumed by farm families reflect to a great extent the quantities that were produced at home. The much greater consumption of milk by white than Negro farm families, even at given income levels, is largely due to the fact that the latter are less likely to have cows. It appears significant that the consumption of milk increased more with family size in the case of white farm operators than in the case of Negro farm families or white sharecroppers. The same contrast occurred in the consumption of potatoes.

With regard to various foodstuffs, Negro farm families, including both operators and sharecroppers, were worse off even than white sharecroppers. This was particularly true with regard to milk, eggs, poultry, and potatoes. The average consumption of grain products⁷ was, however, about the same for Negro farm families as for families of white sharecroppers and operators alike. The average quantities of various foods consumed by white operators were consistently larger than those consumed by white sharecroppers except in the case of flour and cereals.

Data on the consumption of various foods by Negro and white school children in two Texas counties offer corroborative evidence of racial differences in food consumption (Appendix table 28). Both in Brazos County, which is a rural county characterized by diversified farming but with cotton the leading crop, and in Jefferson County in the Gulf coast region, where 90 per cent of the population is urban, Negro school children consume considerably less of most of the protective foods than do white children.

⁶ Hazel K. Stiebeling and Esther F. Phipard, *Diets of Families of Employed Wage Earners and Clerical Workers in Cities*, Circular No. 507, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, 1939, Table 13, footnote 2.

⁷ Baked goods were not included, but the quantities consumed on southern farms, even by white operators, were small.

PROPORTIONS OF FAMILIES THAT CONSUME VARIOUS FOODS

The data from the Consumer Purchases Study on food consumption (both value and quantity) discussed thus far related to all families sampled, regardless of whether they reported consumption of the particular food or group of foods. One reason for the low average consumption figures in the case of certain foods is that some families did not use them at all during the week for which they supplied data. Some milk, some fresh fruit, fresh vegetables, and potatoes ought to be included, however, in the daily diet of every individual, even if living on a restricted budget; and at least one or two eggs a week should be included. The large number of families, particularly in the Negro group, that did not consume one or another of these foods during an entire week provides the most telling evidence, therefore, in regard to the extent of dietary deficiencies (Appendix table 29). Consumption of the protective foods in inadequate amounts is serious, but complete absence of these foods from the diet for any length of time is even more dangerous to health. Of all the Negro farm families sampled in the South only 34 per cent reported the consumption of any fresh fruit during an entire week sometime between the beginning of March and the end of November; only 66 per cent used eggs or milk, and only 86 per cent reported the consumption of fresh vegetables. Even potatoes (Irish and sweet), which are relatively cheap, were consumed by only slightly more than half of these southern Negro farm families. The situation was somewhat better among white sharecroppers and still more favorable among white farm operators. This was partly due to the fact that the income level of whites, especially operators, was higher than that of Negro operators and sharecroppers combined. Even among white operators, however, one-third did not use any fresh fruit and over one-fourth did not use potatoes during the week for which they reported. About 11 per cent did not include fluid milk or eggs in their diet, and 8 per cent did not have fresh vegetables.

In general, the proportion of families that reported consumption of the various protective foods increased fairly steadily with rising incomes. There were some families among the white farm operators with incomes of \$3,000 and more, however, that did not report consumption of specific items. This indicates that nutritive deficiencies are not always caused by economic factors, however important such factors are, but sometimes are rather the result of traditional dietary habits.

Finally, it is significant that there was no clear evidence that increasing family size was accompanied by an increase in the relative number of families consuming the important protective foods. Indeed, among rural Negroes especially the proportion that used milk, eggs, and fresh fruit tended to be smaller in the case of the very large than of the very small families.

The general picture in the southern villages and in the three southern cities studied was sufficiently similar to the farm situation to make detailed comment unnecessary. Two points should be noted, however. First, the proportion of families consuming fresh fruits was considerably higher in villages than in farm areas and in cities than in villages, both in general and at corresponding income levels. This reflects the highly developed system of marketing which makes fresh fruits easily available in cities and possibly also the higher educational standard and the greater detachment from traditional food habits in the urban than the farm population. Second, in non-farm communities there was a significant increase with rising income in the relative number of families reporting milk consumption.

The data presented thus far are highly suggestive of the relative deficiency of the diets of various groups of Negro and white families. Negroes have lower average total food expenditures than white families of the same composition with similar incomes in the same community. At the middle and upper income levels, at least in urban communities, this difference is increased by the fact that whites make larger expenditures for food away from home. Substantial differences remain, however, in regard to expenditures for food for home consumption. This reflects the fact that Negroes allot a larger proportion of their food allowance than do whites to relatively inexpensive foods with a high caloric content. Moreover, Negroes purchase processed foods, which are relatively expensive, much less commonly than whites. In urban communities the use of such foods has become so widespread, at least among whites, that such clearly defined differences in habits of food purchase as shown in Table 42 would certainly have some influence on total food expenditures.⁸ By and large processed foods provide fewer nutrients than an equal quantity of nonprocessed foods, so that the Negro gains in this respect. In regard to the general distribution of the food budget, however, there can be little question that whites obtain a better supply of those foods that are particularly important for the maintenance of health. The fact that in urban areas, at least, Negro families generally

⁸ In the rural South the use of processed foods is so limited that racial differences in that respect are unimportant.

Table 42. - Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga., Reporting Consumption of Specified Processed Foods during One Week, May-August, 1936, by Color and Income

Food category	Less than \$500	Income									
		\$500 - \$999		\$1,000-\$1,499		\$1,500-\$1,999		\$2,000-\$2,999		\$3,000 or more	
		Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Number of families in sample	259	468	149	257	308	42	439	44	543	12	271
Per cent of families reporting consumption of											
Canned vegetables	19.3	30.2	56.7	33.8	58.6	40.5	67.6	34.1	65.5	t	72.8
Canned fruits	4.6	12.4	21.6	16.3	38.5	16.7	50.6	22.7	53.2	t	65.0
Canned soup	1.5	3.0	13.0	2.7	18.0	4.8	13.9	6.8	14.1	-	16.6
Canned pink salmon	18.9	22.9	19.5	28.8	17.5	26.2	21.3	20.4	19.3	t	16.4
Canned meat	1.2	3.0	12.9	3.9	18.7	4.8	15.3	2.3	15.1	t	11.6
Cooked whole meat	0.0	1.5	6.7	0.8	12.1	0.0	11.0	4.5	8.5	t	10.1
Baked goods	56.0	69.2	87.6	75.9	95.2	83.3	98.6	93.2	99.1	t	99.4
Corn flakes	1.5	9.2	23.2	21.4	34.3	33.3	38.3	27.3	43.2	t	43.2
Macaroni	7.3	15.2	24.5	20.2	21.0	14.3	20.8	11.4	23.6	t	16.2
Mayonnaise	9.6	22.0	41.1	33.5	62.0	35.7	60.8	47.7	58.7	t	66.9
Packaged desserts	0.4	2.1	13.0	6.2	20.5	2.4	18.6	0.0	23.3	-	15.2

t Fewer than 25 cases.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 649, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Table 5.

devote a somewhat smaller proportion of their total expenditures to food than white families with similar incomes suggests that Negroes consider other goods and services more important. On the other hand, data presented above suggest that with increases in income Negro families increase their consumption of the protective foods more rapidly than whites.

NUTRITIVE CONTENT OF DIETS

A precise indication of the relative adequacy of the diets of Negro and white families can be obtained only through analysis of the nutritive content of their food supplies. Such an analysis has been completed for farm families on the basis of the Consumer Purchases Study.⁹ The corresponding analyses for city and village families were not available in time for detailed use, but information on urban families can be obtained from the study of employed wage earners and clerical workers,¹⁰ even though this sample study was never intended to be representative of the total population.

The consumption data refer to quantities of food brought into the kitchen for family meals rather than to quantities eaten. Hence, although in estimating the nutritive value account was taken of the average amount of refuse or inedible material in the different food items, the figures shown are probably somewhat higher than the

⁹ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 405.

¹⁰ See Hazel K. Stiebeling and Esther F. Phipard, *op. cit.*

The families participating in this special food study were selected from a larger group sampled in the study of the income and disbursements of employed wage earners and clerical workers, 1934-36. The plan was to obtain from about one-fourth of the families co-operating in the general study records of food consumption during one week in each of the four seasons, but many that agreed to co-operate proved unwilling to continue in succeeding seasons, after keeping the records for one week. In such cases the family next on the list was requested to supply information for the succeeding periods. As a result there was a certain selective bias in the sample of families that kept food records.

"The consumption of food during the week was determined by taking an inventory, by weight, of food on hand at the beginning and end of the period, and obtaining a day-by-day record of the food purchased or brought into the house from market, garden, cellar, or other source of supply . . . certain information was obtained regarding each person fed from the family food supply. For each regular member of the household this included age, height, weight, sex, and a statement of the major kinds of work or activity engaged in day by day, and the approximate time involved" (pp. 4-5), in order to provide a basis for estimating food needs.

Food records were obtained from southern Negro families in Richmond, Va., Birmingham and Mobile, Ala., Memphis, Tenn., and New Orleans, La., and from whites in the following three East South Central cities: Birmingham and Mobile, Ala., and Memphis, Tenn. Some white families in other sections of the South participated in the survey. Since records were obtained from only a small number of such families, however, and since they relate to only one or two seasons, no consideration is given the findings in this chapter.

values of actual food intake, since neither kitchen nor plate waste was accounted for. The nutritive values were estimated by applying average figures on the nutritive composition of each food to the consumption data.¹¹

Since the need for the different nutrients varies widely with the sex and age of persons and the degree of their activity, standard allowances for each nutrient were computed for a nutrition-requirement unit,' which thus served as a common denominator for the varying needs of persons of different sex, age, and activity.¹² In connection with the special food survey the size of households was determined in nutrition-requirement units as well as in persons. The average amounts of the various nutrients supplied daily by the diets of Negro and white families, as shown in Table 43, were thus computed per requirement unit, so that direct comparisons may be made with the indicated standard allowances. When considering these data it should be recognized, however, that the computation of family size in nutrition-requirement units involved use of rather arbitrary allowances for different persons.¹³ Indeed, knowledge of nutritive needs and also of the nutritive content of various foods is the subject of continuing research.

Although the general averages shown in Table 43 greatly overstate actual conditions, particularly in the case of Negroes, and thus minimize race differences, it is of some interest to consider them. The diets of the urban whites supplied larger quantities of seven of the nine nutrients than the diets of the urban Negroes. Negroes obtained about the same amount of iron, on the average, and somewhat more vitamin A value. The diets of Negroes were particularly deficient in respect to calcium, for which milk is the best source; ascorbic acid, supplied mainly by citrus fruits and tomatoes; and riboflavin, found primarily in green and leafy vegetables, egg yolk, and milk. While the food supply of Negroes provides, according to the general averages, approximately the standard allowance of calories, protein, phosphorus, and iron, it is obvious that a great proportion of the families receive less than the standard even for these nutrients.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39. It should be noted that there are variations in the nutritive content of certain foods, such as milk and butter, according to season and other factors.

¹² In measuring the needs of different individuals, sex and age were taken into account in all cases but degree of activity only in the case of energy requirements. It should be noted, however, that the needs of individuals vary also with height, weight, and other physical characteristics that are not considered. It is probable that variations in need because of such factors are at least partially eliminated by the use of averages.

¹³ Hazel K. Stiebeling and Esther F. Phipard, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

Table 43. - Average Nutritive Value of Diets per Day per Requirement Unit of Negro Families a/ in 5 Southern Cities b/ and of White Families in 3 East South Central Cities, c/ December, 1934-February, 1937

Nutritive values with suggested allowance per requirement unit	All expenditure groups	Weekly per capita expenditure for food									
		Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Number of food records	222	84	37	114	37	97	97	114	37	97	97
Average number of persons per family	3.83	4.66	5.19	3.28	5.38	2.78	4.29	3.28	5.38	2.78	4.29
Average weekly family income	\$17.00	\$29.40	\$15.40	\$16.30	\$27.00	\$20.90	\$31.80	\$16.30	\$27.00	\$20.90	\$31.80
Calories (3,000 net calories) <u>d/</u> ..	3,125	3,288	2,450	3,450	3,050	4,310	3,470	3,450	3,050	4,310	3,470
Protein (67 grams)	65	72	51	70	65	89	78	70	65	89	78
Phosphorus (1.32 grams)	1.30	1.48	1.06	1.40	1.36	1.73	1.55	1.40	1.36	1.73	1.55
Calcium (0.68 grams)	0.46	0.63	0.33	0.54	0.55	0.87	0.68	0.54	0.55	0.87	0.68
Iron (15 milligrams)	14.9	15.0	12.2	16.0	14.2	19.8	15.4	16.0	14.2	19.8	15.4
Vitamin A (6,000 International Units) ..	5,149	4,301	3,600	6,600	3,600	6,500	4,600	6,600	3,600	6,500	4,600
Vitamin B ₁ (500 International Units) ..	434	461	330	480	420	600	490	480	420	600	490
Ascorbic acid (75 milligrams)	47.4	60.0	33.5	57.5	50.0	61.0	67.0	57.5	50.0	61.0	67.0
Riboflavin (600 Sherman Units)	446	564	320	510	480	650	620	510	480	650	620

a/ Nonrelief families of two or more persons of employed wage earners and lower-salaried clerical workers

b/ Richmond, Va.; Birmingham and Mobile, Ala.; Memphis, Tenn.; and New Orleans, La.

c/ Birmingham and Mobile, Ala.; and Memphis, Tenn.

d/ The totals include 17 records for white families in the \$0.63 - \$1.24 expenditure group and 18 records for Negro families in the \$2.50 - \$3.12 group. Weights used were the total number of requirement units, computed by multiplying the number of food records by the average household size in requirement units for each nutrient.

e/ Based on Bureau of Home Economics Scale, which is believed to reflect better than the International Scale (2,700 net calories) the needs of persons in American communities.

Source: Hazel K. Stiebeling and Esther F. Phipard, Diets of Families of Employed Wage Earners and Clerical Workers in Cities, Circular No. 507, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, 1939, pp. 9 and 41-68.

This is corroborated at least in part by the data for different food-expenditure levels.¹⁴ The average value per day per requirement unit of each of the nutrients was below the suggested standard when Negro families spent \$0.63-\$1.24 per person per week for food. Even the caloric content of the diets was inadequate for those spending less than \$1.25 per person per week for food.

The average caloric intake was generally higher for Negroes than for whites at corresponding food-expenditure levels, and it increased more rapidly with rising economic levels in the case of Negroes than of whites. This probably reflects the greater energy needs of Negroes, who are more often employed at heavy labor.¹⁵

The average protein content of the diets of Negroes and whites was about equal to the standard when weekly per person food expenditures were \$1.25-\$1.87 and increased at successive levels of expenditure. In each case it was slightly higher for Negroes than for whites. The situation was approximately the same with respect to phosphorus. About the same amount of calcium was supplied by the foods purchased by Negroes and whites that made similar per person food expenditures. The average calcium content was, however, considerably below standard when per person outlays were below \$1.88 per week and just about equal to the standard when expenditures were \$1.88-\$2.49. An ample supply of vitamin A was obtained, on the average, by Negro families in each food-expenditure group beginning at \$1.25 but by white families only when they spent at least \$2.50 per person per week for food. This is attributable mainly to the more generous supply of leafy, green, and yellow vegetables in the diets of Negroes than of whites¹⁶ and probably also to a difference in the selection of particular greens in this important group, with Negroes tending to use more of the cheap but vitamin-rich collards, kale, turnip and mustard greens. While the vitamin B₁ values averaged higher for Negroes than for whites in the same expenditure class, the average amounts were below stand-

¹⁴ Negro families usually are considerably smaller than white families in the same per capita food-expenditure group because most Negro families can afford a higher per person expenditure only when they are small. This circumstance, however, may limit the comparability of data for Negroes and whites in the same group to some extent since it is probable that dietary patterns show some variation with family size even at given per capita food-expenditure levels.

¹⁵ At least 4,500 calories is indicated by the Food and Nutrition Committee of the National Research Council as the requirement for "a very active man" (*New York Times*, May 24, 1941). Stiebeling and Phipard (*op. cit.*, p. 42) also suggest an allowance of 4,500 calories for a man engaged in "very active work."

¹⁶ This difference is probably exaggerated by the fact that the consumption estimates for Negroes did not take into account the winter months, while those for whites did.

ard for both Negroes and whites in the expenditure groups below \$1.88. The average riboflavin content was sufficient for both Negroes and whites when weekly per person food expenditures were as much as \$1.88. Differences between the two racial groups at corresponding expenditure levels were negligible. Ascorbic acid, or vitamin C, was likewise supplied to about the same extent by the diets of Negroes and whites spending similar amounts for food per person, but it was obtained in sufficient quantity only by those spending \$2.50 or more per person for food.

Average figures conceal the wide variations among individual families. An analysis of individual dietary records was made by the Bureau of Home Economics for families at two expenditure levels for which data were available for Negroes, but the number of Negro cases was sufficient to warrant study of the findings only at the \$1.25-\$1.87 food-expenditure level. It must be kept in mind that such a food-expenditure level probably is somewhat higher than most Negro urban families, and particularly large Negro urban families, can afford.

Table 44 shows the proportion of Negro and white families spending \$1.25-\$1.87 weekly per person for food whose diets supplied less than specified amounts of seven nutrients. The minimum amount of each nutrient needed for a fair diet is indicated in each case by the smaller figure in the table stub and the minimum amount for a good diet is represented by the larger figure. The diet as a whole was classified as poor if the raw foods provided less than the smaller quantity of any one nutrient. It was classed as fair if it was better in every respect than the specifications for poor diets but poorer in one or more nutrients than the specifications for good diets. It was considered good only if the food material furnished at least as much of each nutrient as indicated by the higher allowance. Many families that obtain an adequate supply of one nutrient receive less than the suggested standard for some other nutrient. In consequence, it is not surprising to find that the majority of the families with weekly per person food expenditures of \$1.25-\$1.87 were classified as having poor diets (Table 45). The fact that the proportion of families at this expenditure level that had good and fair diets, respectively, was higher among Negroes than among whites probably reflects to a large extent the greater consumption by Negroes of leafy, green, and yellow vegetables. These data confirm the impression that Negro urban families, at least as far as they have been covered by these sample studies, get an adequate or at least a fair diet for a given amount of money more often than white families because of their

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Table 44 .- Approximate Proportions of Urban Families in a Selected Sample *a/* Whose Diets Provided Less than the "Fair" or "Good" Standard Amounts, Respectively, of Various Nutrients *b/* per Requirement Unit at the \$1.25-\$1.87 Weekly per Capita Food-expenditure Level, by Color, December, 1934-February, 1937

Item	Negro	White	Item	Negro	White
Number of food records	83	114			
Average number of persons per family	3.28	3.38			
Per cent <i>a/</i> of families whose diets provided less than specified amounts of			Per cent <i>a/</i> of families whose diets provided less than specified amounts of		
Energy units			Vitamin A		
3,000 calories	34	45	3,000 International Units,	42	52
Protein			6,000 International Units,	58	76
45 grams	4	2	Vitamin B ₁		
67 grams	43	69	240 International Units,	6	4
Calcium			500 International Units,	63	77
0.45 grams	34	27	Ascorbic acid		
0.68 grams	73	77	37.5 milligrams	23	26
Iron			75 milligrams	76	90
10 milligrams	7	8	Riboflavin		
15 milligrams	47	65	300 Sherman units	16	4
			600 Sherman units	70	75

a/ Nonrelief Negro families of two or more persons of employed wage earners and lower-salaried clerical workers in five southern cities and comparable white families in three East South Central cities.

b/ In each case the smaller figure indicates the amount of the given nutrient required for a "fair" diet; the larger figure indicates the amount required for a "good" diet.

a/ Percentages are only approximate, since they were computed by interpolation.

Source: Hazel K. Stiebeling and Esther F. Phipard, Diets of Families of Employed Wage Earners and Clerical Workers in Cities, Circular No. 507, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, 1939, pp. 41-68.

Table 45. - Grade of Diet of Families of Employed Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers with a Weekly per Capita Food Expenditure of \$1.25-\$1.87, by Color and Region

Color and region	All families	Per cent of families with diets graded as		
		Good	Fair	Poor
White				
All regions	379	1	17	82
East South Central ...	114	1	33	66
Negro				
South	83	5	37	58

Source: Hazel K. Stiebeling and Esther F. Phipard, Diets of Families of Employed Wage Earners and Clerical Workers in Cities, Circular No. 507, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, 1939, pp. 73-74.

less expensive food habits. These findings would become still more important if they could be checked on the basis of more extensive material for urban families. The results indicate, however, that the popular notions concerning Negro improvidence are exaggerated. It has been established that a large number of Negro urban families handle their food money better than white urban families of corresponding economic status.

According to the Consumer Purchases Study data there is no consistent race differential of the same kind in farm areas of the Southeast (Table 46). There is a regional difference, however, in that both white and Negro farm families in the Southeast obtained diets of higher nutritive value in each food value per capita class than farm families in other parts of the country.¹⁷

The diets of southeastern farm families were more satisfactory, on the average, than those of the urban families previously referred to.¹⁸ Even the mean figures for the lowest expenditure group shown indicated relatively good conditions except in regard to ascorbic acid and riboflavin.¹⁹ Nevertheless, there are large numbers of Negro and white farm families in the Southeast which have diets with less than optimal content in various respects (Table 47), and it is apparent that the deficiencies are particularly marked for families which have to restrict their per capita food expenditure to a minimum because of low incomes or large size. Eighty per cent of the Negro families in the food-expenditure group most typical for nonrelief, normal Negro farm households (\$0.69-\$1.37 per expenditure unit per week) had diets which were characterized as poor, and only three per cent had a food consumption which met, or nearly met, requirements for an excellent diet (Table 48).

Some families with even fairly high food expenditures had poor diets. A few white farm families with a weekly food expenditure per expenditure unit of \$2.77-\$3.45 had diets which were classified as poor, and the same situation was found among 26 per cent of the families of white urban wage earners and clerical workers with a weekly per capita food expenditure of \$3.75-\$4.37.²⁰ In view of this

¹⁷ Table 46 contains a comparison with the Middle Atlantic and North Central states only, but other regions of the country show similar conditions. (U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 405, pp. 52-81 and 101.)

¹⁸ It should be remembered, however, that certain large groups of low-income families were excluded from the farm sample.

¹⁹ Estimates of the requirements for riboflavin vary between 1.5 and 2.7 milligrams. (See Table 47, footnote a.)

²⁰ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 405, p. 85; and Hazel K. Stiebeling and Esther F. Phipard, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

Table 46. - Average Nutritive Value of Diets per Nutrition Unit per Day by Money Value of Food per Week per Food-expenditure Unit, for Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Farm Areas, by Color, 1936-37

Money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit and analysis unit	Average nutritive value of diets per nutrition unit per day										
	Number of households	Average number of persons per household	Food energy (calories)	Protein (grams)	Phosphorus (grams)	Calcium (grams)	Iron (milligrams)	Vitamin A (international units)	Thiamin (milligrams)	Ascorbic acid (milligrams)	Riboflavin (milligrams)
\$0.69-\$1.37											
Southeast Negro families	36	5.4	2,900	65	1.57	0.56	16.3	8,100	1.74	38	1.14
Farm operators	73	5.7	3,030	66	1.67	0.60	15.8	9,500	1.71	35	1.23
Sharecroppers											
White operator families	24	(5.6)	(2,920)	(66)	(1.66)	(0.58)	(14.9)	(7,000)	(1.54)	(42)	(1.14)
Southeast											
\$1.39-\$2.07											
Southeast Negro families	36	4.9	4,430	96	2.21	0.85	22.9	13,900	2.22	50	1.92
Farm operators	51	4.3	4,020	92	2.16	0.87	23.7	16,000	2.28	55	1.89
Sharecroppers											
White operator families	133	5.5	3,730	90	2.14	0.96	19.5	9,600	2.12	55	2.04
Southeast											
Middle Atlantic and North Central	36	5.7	3,060	81	1.49	0.68	14.5	5,600	1.68	66	1.98
\$2.08-\$3.76											
Southeast Negro families	14	(3.6)	(5,070)	(130)	(3.29)	(1.78)	(26.6)	(5,100)	(2.76)	(60)	(3.42)
Farm operators	20	(3.5)	(4,780)	(119)	(2.76)	(1.27)	(25.0)	(16,200)	(3.03)	(68)	(2.73)
Sharecroppers											
White operator families	150	4.6	4,580	112	2.56	1.22	22.6	12,000	2.74	68	2.82
Southeast											
Middle Atlantic and North Central	88	4.9	3,600	98	1.80	0.87	17.6	6,800	2.28	69	2.46
\$3.77-\$5.45											
White operator families											
Southeast	64	3.8	5,400	137	3.05	1.48	26.4	12,700	3.03	80	3.30
Middle Atlantic and North Central	80	4.2	4,070	111	1.93	0.82	21.1	8,400	2.75	88	2.73

✓ An allowance of 1.5 milligrams of thiamin is the equivalent of 500 International Units of vitamin B₁. See Table 47.

5/ An allowance of 1.5 milligrams of thiamin is the equivalent of 500 International Units of vitamin B₁. See Table 47.

Notes: Figures in parentheses are based on 10 to 25 cases.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 405, pp. 52-61 and 101.

Table 47. - Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Farm Families in the Southeast Whose Diets during One Week Were below Optimal Requirements in Various Respects, by Color and Selected Food-expenditure Groups, 1936-37

Item	Suggested optimal requirements per nutrition unit per day	Money value of food per week per food-expenditure unit					
		Negro farm operators and sharecroppers		White farm operators			
		\$0.69-\$1.37	\$1.38-\$2.07	\$1.38-\$2.07	\$2.08-\$2.76	\$2.77-\$3.45	
Number of families		109	89	133	76	64	
Per cent of diets furnishing less than the suggested requirements							
Energy value	3,000 calories	50	7	16	1	0	0
Protein	57 grams	57	14	4	0	0	0
Phosphorus	1.32 grams	24	9	2	0	0	0
Calcium	0.68 gram	60	34	23	6	3	3
Iron	12 grams	22	9	4	1	0	0
Vitamin A	6,000 International Units	52	23	44	37	23	23
Thiamin	1.5 milligrams	47	30	17	5	0	0
Ascorbic acid	75 milligrams	96	81	79	65	55	55
Riboflavin	1.8 milligrams	79	48	38	9	6	6

a/ The optimal requirements for thiamin and particularly for riboflavin are less well known than for other nutritive items. The Food and Nutrition Committee of the National Research Council suggests 1.8 milligrams for thiamin and 2.7 milligrams for riboflavin (New York Times, May 26, 1941). Stiebeling and Monroe, (U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 405, p. 374) give a tentative range of 1.5 to 2.0 milligrams for both items. An allowance of 1.5 milligrams of thiamin is the equivalent of 500 International Units of vitamin B₁. (See Table 44.)

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 405, pp. 52-81 and 103.

Table 48. Selected Groups of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Farm Families, by Grade of Diet and Color, 1936-37

Grade <i>a/</i> of diet	Money value of food per week per expenditure unit					
	\$0.69-\$1.37	\$1.38-\$2.07		\$2.08-\$2.76		
	Negro farm operators and sharecroppers in the Southeast	Negro farm operators and sharecroppers in the Southeast	White farm operators	White farm operators	White farm operators	White farm operators
			South-east	North and West <i>b/</i>	South-east	North and West <i>b/</i>
Number of families	109	69	133	63	76	168
Per cent of families with diets graded as						
*Excellent or good ..	3	19	26	14	58	43
Fair	17	39	41	56	25	47
Poor	80	42	33	30	17	10

a/ Diets were classified as poor if they failed to meet any one of the following requirements in regard to the food content per nutrition unit per day: protein 50 grams, calcium 0.45 gram, phosphorus 0.88 gram, iron 10 milligrams, vitamin A 3,000 International Units, thiamin 1.0 milligram or 333 International Units, ascorbic acid 30 milligrams or 600 International Units, riboflavin 0.9 milligram. They were classed as fair if they met all these requirements but by less than a 50 per cent margin with respect to one or more nutrients; as good if the diets contained at least 50 per cent more of each nutrient but less than 100 per cent more in the case of the vitamins; and as excellent if they provided for at least 100 per cent more of vitamins and riboflavin and 50 per cent more of other nutrients than is needed for a fair diet. An excellent diet consequently meets about the same requirements as is indicated in Table 47 and corresponds roughly to what is called a good diet in Table 44.

b/ New England, Middle Atlantic and North Central, Plains and Mountain, and Pacific regions.

Sources: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 405, pp. 82, 85, and 106.

fact it is appropriate to ask what is the minimum amount of money per capita for which at least a fair diet, or even a good diet, can be obtained.

A theoretically satisfactory answer on this question could be obtained on the basis of a list of foods so composed that it would provide for an adequate diet at the lowest possible cost. It is quite probable, however, that such a diet would be so far removed from actual food habits that there would not be any prospect of its general adoption. Nor is there any guarantee that all foodstuffs on this list would be produced and marketed under present conditions in large enough quantities to meet the demands of the whole population. A more practical approach has been made by Stiebeling and Phipard, who determined the smallest amount per person for which some small portion of a sample was able to purchase a diet of a certain standard. All homemakers cannot have expert knowledge of the nutritive values of various foods in relation to their cost. If some housewives, however, who are probably not especially well educated actually have succeeded in buying an adequate diet for a certain small sum of money, it is possible that eventually most housewives in similar economic circumstances could be taught to use their food money in

the same way, provided an extensive educational program to that end was inaugurated.

On the basis of the study of wage earners and clerical workers in cities,²¹ it was found that practically all southern Negro families had diets which were poor when the value of the food consumed was less than \$0.95 per person per week at 1935-36 prices and that only 10 per cent of those having good diets spent \$1.90 or less per person per week. For white families in the East South Central region the corresponding figures were \$1.00 and \$2.15. The annual cost, according to both sets of figures, was roughly \$50 per person as the minimum for a fair diet and \$100 per person for a good diet.²²

Among the middle-sized and large Negro families in Columbia, Mobile, and Atlanta only a minority devoted enough money to their food budgets for the purchase of good diets and a large number of them spent even less than was necessary for a fair diet (Table 49). Conditions were somewhat better in Columbus, Ohio, but even there most middle-sized and large Negro families spent less than was necessary for a good diet.

Spending too little money on food, however, is not always a result of extreme poverty. As illustrated by the data for southern villages (Table 50), it occurs even when incomes are fairly high and, together with lack of skill in marketing, cooking, or composition of diets, it represents a major cause of such dietary deficiencies as are not brought about by economic conditions. Also some low-income families spend much more for food than is necessary, thereby jeopardizing the adequacy of their living conditions in other vital respects, such as housing, clothing, and medical care. At the same time the village data provide additional evidence of the extremely low dietary levels in many Negro families.²³

²¹ Hazel K. Stiebeling and Esther F. Phipard, *op. cit.*, pp. 79-85. For definitions of good and fair diets in terms of nutritive content, see pp. 121-122.

²² The corresponding figures for other areas were somewhat higher.

²³ Twenty-eight per cent of all large (types VI and VII) Negro nonrelief families in the southern-village sample spent less than 3.3 cents per meal per food-expenditure unit or approximately \$36 per year.

Table 49. - Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families Which Spent Less than \$50 and Less than \$100 for Food per Person per Year in Selected Cities, by Color and Family Type, ^{a/} 1935-36

City	Negro								White			
	Per cent of families which spent the specified amount, by family type											
	I	II-III	IV-V	VI-VII	I	II-III	IV-V	VI-VII	I	II-III	IV-V	VI-VII
Columbia, S. C., and Mobile, Ala.												
Less than \$50	0	8	28	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-
Less than \$100	46	89	88	-	0	25	16	16	-	-	-	-
Atlanta, Ga.												
Less than \$50	0	4	2	17	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-
Less than \$100	25	82	79	97	0	8	13	13	-	-	-	-
Columbus, Ohio												
Less than \$50	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Less than \$100	0	53	58	-	0	5	10	10	42	42	42	42

^{a/} For a description of family types, see p. 80.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletins No. 644 and 647, Vol. I, Tabular Summary, Table 1, and Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Tables 2 and 3.

Table 50. - Per Cent Distribution of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in 34 Southern Villages by Money Value of Food a/ per meal per Food-expenditure Unit, by Family Type, b/ Income, and Color, March-November, 1936

Color, March-November, 1930

Family type and income	Per cent of families having food with specified money value per meal per unit (in cents)											
	Negro					White						
	Less than 3.29	3.29- 6.57	6.58- 9.86	9.87- 13.15	13.16- 16.44	16.45 or more	Less than 3.29	3.29- 6.57	6.58- 9.86	9.87- 13.15	13.16- 16.44	16.45 or more
All groups	7.5	41.0	29.1	14.5	4.7	3.2	0.2	6.8	27.1	32.0	17.0	16.9
Family type I	2.3	22.8	33.8	23.3	10.0	7.8	0.4	1.8	11.8	27.7	25.1	33.2
II-III	5.3	50.0	30.0	11.2	2.9	0.6	0.2	4.0	29.2	36.7	14.5	15.4
IV-V	8.1	50.3	28.0	11.2	1.2	1.2	0.0	9.3	28.7	31.6	17.7	12.7
VI-VII	27.8	54.1	15.3	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.3	46.6	25.9	6.9	2.3
Less than \$500	10.5	55.1	25.8	7.2	1.1	0.3	0.0	22.0	44.1	25.4	6.8	1.7
\$500-\$999	3.8	21.9	33.8	26.2	9.1	5.2	0.7	16.4	36.9	29.9	11.7	4.4
\$1,000-\$1,499	(0.0)	(10.0)	(36.7)	(20.0)	(16.7)	(16.6)	0.0	4.7	32.0	33.4	15.8	14.1
\$1,500-\$1,999	t	t	t	t	t	t	0.0	1.7	24.4	35.3	17.2	21.4
\$2,000 or more	t	t	t	t	t	t	0.0	1.2	12.7	31.2	24.5	30.4

t Fewer than 25 cases.

a/ Adjusted to June-August, 1936, price levels.

b/ For a description of family types, see p. 80.

Note: Figures within parentheses are based on 25 to 50 cases.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 452, Table 28.

Chapter VIII

FAMILY EXPENDITURES FOR GOODS AND SERVICES OTHER THAN FOOD AND HOUSING

Other chapters analyze consumption patterns of Negroes and whites with regard to food and housing. In this chapter expenditures for the other main categories of expenditures are considered. Since there are scarcely any generally accepted standards by which to judge the adequacy of these expenditure items, attention will be centered almost exclusively on differences between Negro and white families in various types of communities.¹

HOUSEHOLD OPERATION AND FURNISHINGS

Once a dwelling unit has been acquired, maintenance of a home requires, in addition to furnishings, heat, light, and refrigeration, provision for water, for laundry and cleaning, for garbage and ash removal, and for sundry other items.² When income permits, household help falls into the same category, but otherwise the domestic functions are performed by the housewife and other family members. The services of the latter cannot be evaluated satisfactorily and hence are not included among expenditures (nonmoney expenditures) for household operation, although they constitute an important part of the real value of family living. Also, the value of fuel, light, and refrigeration has been omitted, although it frequently exceeds that of other items of household operation.³

At given income levels outlays for household operation (exclusive of fuel, light, and refrigeration) were lower among Negro than

¹ The tables are often merely illustrative. Full details regarding the various items of consumption are found in publications of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and the U. S. Department of Agriculture based on data from the Consumer Purchases Study.

² Such as household disinfectants and insecticides, moving charges, express and freight fees, stationery, and postage.

³ In farm areas fuel is often obtained without direct expenditure, and its valuation is subject to considerable error. In urban areas one or more of these items may be included in the rent paid by tenants with the result that the average amounts reported are more or less incomplete.

Table 51.—Average Expenditure and Proportion of Total Expenditures by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Household Operation, a/ by Family Type, b/ Income, and Color, 1935-36

Family type and income	Georgia-Mississippi farm operators						Atlanta, Ga.			New York, N. Y.		
	Negro			White			Negro			White		
	Average ex- pend- iture	Per cent of total	Per cent of ex- pend- iture	Average ex- pend- iture	Per cent of total	Per cent of ex- pend- iture	Average ex- pend- iture	Per cent of total	Per cent of ex- pend- iture	Average ex- pend- iture	Per cent of total	Per cent of ex- pend- iture
All groups	\$ 6	1.0	\$ 38	3.4	28	3.3	\$ 150	7.3	\$ 56	3.7	\$153	6.0
Family type I	5	1.0	40	4.2	29	3.7	140	7.2	57	4.0	143	6.0
II-III	6	1.1	39	3.7	26	3.3	144	7.4	47	3.3	159	6.5
IV-V	7	1.1	47	3.5	29	3.1	163	7.2	67	3.8	155	5.4
VI-VII	6	1.0	15	1.6	25	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less than \$500	4	1.0	8	1.7	11	2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$500-\$999	6	0.9	13	1.7	21	2.7	38	4.3	27	2.7	31	2.8
\$1,000-\$1,499	10	1.1	28	2.4	42	3.5	65	4.9	41	3.2	47	3.4
\$1,500-\$1,999(\$2,249) c/	-	-	42	3.0	85	5.1	121	6.5	79	4.4	79	4.1
\$2,000(\$2,250) c/- \$2,999	-	-	79	4.2	103	5.2	180	7.4	101	4.2	125	4.9
\$3,000 or more	-	-	223	6.5	(223)	(7.3)	386	9.6	6	6	412	8.5

a/ Fewer than 10 cases.

a/ Other than fuel, light, and refrigeration.

b/ For a description of family types, see p. 80.

c/ For Atlanta and New York, the income classes are \$1,500 - \$2,249 and \$2,250 - \$2,999.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 10 to 25 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletins No. 643 and 647, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Table 2; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 465, Tables 35, 40, and 46, and unpublished data.

white families in 1935-36 (Table 51). This was particularly marked in southern rural areas. At the same time there was a steady increase in such expenditures by both Negroes and whites with movement from southern farms to urban areas.

The number of members in the family appeared to bear little relationship to average expenditures for household operation. Thus, as usual, large families were worse off than small ones. Variations in family income, on the other hand, had a decided influence. This indicates that the need and desire for various household supplies and services are not easily satisfied. The major portion of the increase was apparently attributable to the increased demand for domestic service. Household help was employed by only 4 per cent of the nonrelief normal Negro families studied in Atlanta during 1935-36 but by nearly 50 per cent of the corresponding white families. The average amount spent per year per family (including those families which did not have any household help) was \$2 and \$64, respectively.⁴ That the proportion of nonrelief families having hired help was much lower among Negroes than whites even at given income levels is indicated by the following figures for Atlanta:⁵

Income	Per cent of families reporting expenditures for household help	
	Negro	White
All incomes.....	4	47
Less than \$500.....	1	—
\$500-\$999.....	3	16
\$1,000-\$1,499.....	3	20
\$1,500-\$1,999.....	11	40
\$2,000-\$2,999.....	22	62
\$3,000 or more.....	t	89

⁴ Fewer than 25 cases.

In respect to expenditures for household supplies and services other than domestic help, it was found from preliminary examination of the detailed data for Columbia, Mobile, and Atlanta

that laundry expense was of major importance, with telephone costs running second. At the lowest income levels, families spent more for

⁴ U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 647, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Table 5.

⁵ *Idem*.

laundry supplies for washing at home than for laundry sent out. At higher income levels, however, this relationship was reversed, since the average expense for laundry supplies varied little with income, while that for laundry sent out increased rapidly even among Negro families.⁶

There is evidence, moreover, that in these cities white families sent out their laundry much more commonly than Negro families even at the same income levels.⁷ Thus in Atlanta, Georgia, white families in the \$2,250-\$2,499 income class averaged \$50.10 for laundry sent out, while Negro families at the same income level spent only half as much (\$25.00).

Expenditures for furnishings and equipment are different in character from those for household operation. While many of the small items, such as kitchen utensils, china, glassware, and some household linens, must be replaced more or less frequently, the remainder of the items, such as furniture, floor coverings, sewing machines, and refrigerators, are purchased infrequently by any given family. In consequence, average figures are particularly unrepresentative of the general level of spending, since they reflect the fact that most families spent small amounts for routine items and occasional families made larger outlays during the year for expensive, durable equipment.

While the differences between the general average expenditures of Negro and white families for furnishings and equipment were smaller than the differences for household operation, there can be little doubt that by and large Negro homes are less well furnished than those of whites (Table 52). Even when Negro families had the same incomes as white families, they spent less on the average for furnishings and equipment. Among both groups average expenditures for such goods increased with income, but in neither group was the proportion of the total budget allotted to this category clearly related to income.

The extremely small expenditures for furnishings and equipment by farm families in the South attest to the meagerness of the furnishings in their homes. With their very low incomes little money could be allocated to other than the items essential for bare existence. Moreover, the great mobility of southern sharecroppers and other tenants may account in part for this condition, since a family that moves frequently has less incentive than a stable family to spend

⁶ U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 647, Vol. II, p. 40.

⁷ U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. I, Tabular Summary, Table 8.

Table 52. Average Expenditure and Proportion of Total Expenditures of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Household Furnishings and Equipment, by Family Type, ^a/ Income, and Color, 1935-36

Family type and income	Georgia-Mississippi counties										Atlanta, Ga.		
	Farm operators					Sharecroppers					Negro Average cent expenditure	White Average cent expenditure	
	Negro		White		Per cent of total	Negro		White		Per cent of total			Per cent of total
	Average expenditure	Per cent of total	Average expenditure	Per cent of total		Average expenditure	Per cent of total	Average expenditure	Per cent of total				
All groups	\$ 9	1.5	\$ 29	2.5	1.2	\$ 5	1.2	\$10	1.7	3.3	\$ 78	3.8	
Family type I.....	6	1.3	22	2.3	1.5	5	1.5	16	3.2	3.7	86	4.4	
II-III.....	9	1.6	32	3.0	1.3	5	1.3	10	1.9	3.4	76	3.9	
IV-V.....	11	1.7	34	2.5	1.3	6	1.3	9	1.4	3.2	73	3.2	
VI-VII.....	8	1.3	16	1.7	1.0	5	1.0	9	1.4	2.2	-	-	
Less than \$500.....	4	1.0	8	1.7	0.9	3	0.9	6	1.4	2.0	-	-	
\$500-\$999.....	11	1.7	13	1.7	1.6	10	1.6	14	2.0	3.1	36	4.1	
\$1,000-\$1,499.....	19	2.1	25	2.2	-	-	-	-	-	4.2	68	5.1	
\$1,500-\$1,999(\$2,249) b/.....	-	-	36	2.6	-	-	-	-	-	2.4	82	4.4	
\$2,000(\$2,250)b/-\$2,999.....	-	-	58	3.1	-	-	-	-	-	4.1	78	3.2	
\$3,000 or more.....	-	-	120	3.5	-	-	-	-	-	(2.6)	116	2.9	

^{a/} For a description of family types, see p. 80.

^{b/} For Atlanta, the income classes are \$1,500-\$2,249 and \$2,250-\$2,999.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 23 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 647, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Table 2; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 465, Tables 35, 40, and 46, and unpublished data.

Table 53.—Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Ownership of Specified Equipment, by Income and Color, 1935-36

Community or group and income	Negro						White					
	Per cent of families reporting ownership of			Per cent of families reporting ownership of			Per cent of families reporting ownership of			Per cent of families reporting ownership of		
	Refrigerator	Washing machine	Vacuum cleaner	Refrigerator	Washing machine	Vacuum cleaner	Refrigerator	Washing machine	Vacuum cleaner	Refrigerator	Washing machine	Vacuum cleaner
Georgia-Mississippi counties												
Farm operators	1	0	0	0	0	0	63	1	2	1	79	65
Sharecroppers	0	5	0	0	0	0	35	*	0	0		
North Carolina-South Carolina counties												
Farm operators	17	*	0	0	0	0	68	2	1	1	84	72
Sharecroppers	0	8	0	0	0	0	53	1	0	*		
Atlanta, Ga.												
All incomes	6	91	1	4	4	4	38	37	35	15	46	
Less than \$500 ...	2	93	0	0	*	0	23	-	-	-	-	-
\$500-\$999	2	95	0	3	3	3	36	3	5	1	49	49
\$1,000-\$1,499	13	86	3	3	9	9	54	13	13	12	49	49
\$1,500-\$1,999	33	65	5	21	6	6	60	11	31	13	51	51
\$2,000-\$2,999	48	51	14	24	20	20	60	15	47	16	45	45
\$3,000 or more	t	t	t	t	t	t	t	10	70	30	35	35
Columbus, Ohio												
All incomes	15	87	37	36	4	4	39	48	78	21	45	
Less than \$500 ...	t	t	t	t	t	t	t	-	-	-	-	-
\$500-\$999	3	95	23	23	1	1	39	12	47	4	43	43
\$1,000-\$1,499	19	84	48	45	3	3	42	67	67	15	52	52
\$1,500-\$1,999	(54)	(57)	(55)	(57)	(22)	(22)	(19)	48	81	21	44	44
\$2,000-\$2,999	(48)	(60)	(81)	(85)	(23)	(23)	(52)	35	90	26	44	44
\$3,000 or more ...	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	95	35	36	36

*Less than 0.5 per cent.

t Fewer than 25 cases.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 25 to 50 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 646, Vol. IV, Table 3; and

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 436, Table 15.

such money as is available on furniture and other equipment for the home. The effect of these conditions, however, cannot be fully evaluated on the basis of the Consumer Purchases Study, since farm families which had moved within the year were excluded from the sample.

Information on the ownership of various items of household equipment provides a more satisfactory measure of home conditions than data on average expenditures for such goods, both because it is more precise and because it represents the situation over a relatively long period of time. About 80 per cent of the Negro farm operators and more than 90 per cent of the sharecroppers in the South were without refrigerators of any sort. Almost 80 per cent of the white sharecroppers did not have refrigerators, but over 50 per cent of the white operators had some sort of refrigeration (Table 53). Washing machines and vacuum cleaners were practically never found in the homes of southern farm families of either race. Sewing machines, however, were fairly common with about two-thirds of all Negro operators and one-third to one-half of the Negro sharecroppers reporting this convenience. Sewing machines were owned by about four-fifths of the white operators and by two-thirds or more of the white sharecroppers.

Data for families in Atlanta and Columbus provide evidence as to the general situation and, in addition, indicate the influence of income on the ownership of various types of equipment. In contrast to the situation in the rural South, practically all nonrelief families in large cities, Negro as well as white, have refrigerators. At the same income levels, however, mechanical refrigerators were found more frequently in the homes of whites than of Negroes. At successively higher income levels the proportion of both Negro and white families owning mechanical refrigerators increased and the proportion with iceboxes declined. Washing machines and vacuum cleaners were reported more frequently in Columbus than in Atlanta, and in both cities they were much more likely to be found in the homes of whites than of Negroes with similar incomes. Ownership of sewing machines in Atlanta and Columbus appeared to bear relatively little relationship either to race or to family income. More striking is the fact that sewing machines were considerably less common in the cities than in the rural South.

Apparently, race differences may be due not only to income factors but also to a lag among Negroes in appreciation of the usefulness of modern household equipment. On the other hand, it may be that the high-pressure salesman has been less active in Negro than

white neighborhoods. It is probable, in any case, that it is more difficult for the Negro than for the white to obtain installment credit, the basis on which the low- or moderate-income family so largely purchases durable equipment.

CLOTHING

Expenditures for clothing like those for furnishings and equipment involve many small items which must be purchased frequently and more durable articles, such as overcoats, which are used from year to year, particularly when income is limited. They resemble expenditures for household services, on the other hand, in their marked increase with rising income.

Clothing for the family members accounted on the average for approximately 10 per cent of the total family expenditures of both whites and Negroes (Table 54). At given income levels average expenditures for clothing were somewhat smaller among Negroes than among whites in farm areas but, more often than not, slightly larger among Negroes than whites in urban communities. Moreover, clothing absorbed a slightly larger share of the budgets of Negro than white families with similar incomes in cities.

Among urban families of both races average clothing expenditures increased with income considerably more rapidly than total expenditures, but the rise was somewhat more rapid in the case of Negroes.⁸ Together with the fact that a larger proportion of total expenditures was devoted to clothing by Negroes than by whites with similar incomes in urban communities, this suggests that the former may attach more importance than whites to clothing.

Clothing expenditures are not closely related to the number of members in the family. When the general averages were considered, families containing at least three adults (types IV and V) spent more, and even a slightly larger proportion of their budgets, in this way than smaller families. They also spent more than the largest families studied, which contain mostly children under 16 years of age. While it is true that clothing is cheaper for children than for adults, children's clothing must be replaced more frequently. There can therefore be little doubt that many children, particularly in Negro families, must have been outfitted almost entirely in partly

⁸ The latter point appears in the table only in the case of Atlanta. In other non-farm communities and community groups, which do not appear in the table, however, the percentage of the total expenditures that was used for clothing increased more rapidly with income in Negro than white families (U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 396, Part 2, pp. 125 and 133).

Table 54. Average Expenditure and Proportion of Total Expenditures by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Clothing, by Color, Family Type, $\$$ and Income, 1935-36

Community or community group and color	All groups	Family Type				Less than \$500	Income				\$3,000- or more
		I	II-III	IV-V	VI-VII		\$500- \$999	\$1,000- \$1,499	\$1,500- \$1,999	\$2,000- \$2,999	
<u>Average expenditure for clothing</u>											
<u>Georgia-Mississippi counties</u>											
<u>Farm operators</u>											
Negro	661	\$40	\$58	\$76	\$58	\$35	\$71	\$112	-	-	\$993
White	126	86	109	159	112	44	78	125	\$169	\$215	-
<u>Sharecroppers</u>											
Negro	144	29	41	54	42	33	67	-	-	-	-
White	60	40	53	74	63	43	72	-	-	-	-
<u>Atlanta, Ga.</u>											
Negro	85	71	71	104	96	24	72	137	206	246	(143)
White	208	183	195	239	-	-	72	127	180	257	427
<u>New York, N. Y.</u>											
Negro	131	123	124	161	-	-	59	103	183	242	t
White	229	211	212	267	-	-	61	89	153	239	468
<u>Clothing expenditure as per cent of total expenditures</u>											
<u>Georgia-Mississippi counties</u>											
<u>Farm operators</u>											
Negro	10.5	8.4	10.5	11.7	9.3	9.0	10.7	12.3	-	-	-
White	11.0	8.9	10.2	11.8	12.0	9.4	10.3	10.9	12.2	11.4	11.5
<u>Sharecroppers</u>											
Negro	10.5	9.0	10.8	11.3	8.8	10.2	10.6	-	-	-	-
White	10.2	8.0	9.9	11.2	9.8	10.1	10.2	-	-	-	-
<u>Atlanta, Ga.</u>											
Negro	9.9	9.1	9.0	11.0	10.6	5.3	9.4	11.4	12.2	12.4	(14.5)
White	10.1	9.4	10.1	10.5	-	-	8.1	9.6	9.7	10.6	10.6
<u>New York, N. Y.</u>											
Negro	8.7	8.6	8.8	9.1	-	-	6.0	7.9	10.1	10.1	t
White	8.9	8.8	8.7	9.1	-	-	5.5	6.4	7.9	9.3	10.1

$\$$ For a definition of family types, see p. 80.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 23 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletins No. 643 and 647, Tabular Summary, Table 2; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 468, Tables 36, 40, and 46, and unpublished data.

worn clothes that were handed down by other family members or were donated from various sources.

At given income levels both husbands and wives reduced their own clothing expenditures considerably to meet the needs of other family members. Among Negro families in Atlanta with incomes below \$500, for example, the clothing expenditures of husbands averaged \$10 and those of wives \$12 when there were no other members in the family, but when the families contained three to five additional members, both husbands and wives reduced their outlays to \$5 per year on the average (Table 55). Both in general and at corresponding income levels, differences between the average expenditures of wives in small and large families were considerably greater than the corresponding differences in the outlays of husbands. With increasing income wives increased their expenditures for clothing more rapidly than husbands. These findings suggest that there is a minimum expenditure for clothing required by the male breadwinner, while his wife, if she does not work, can reduce her clothing budget much more drastically when economic pressure demands.

A more precise indication of the extent of clothing deficiencies is provided by figures on the relative numbers that actually purchased specified articles of clothing at some time during the year. The proportion of a large group of persons that purchases a particular item of clothing during one year is generally considered a reasonable index of the frequency of replacement over a period of years among persons at a given economic level. In other words, if 50 per cent of the husbands in a particular economic group bought shirts during the year, one would conclude that men in those circumstances normally buy one or more shirts every other year.

The relatively small proportion of men in Columbia, Mobile, and Atlanta at the lower income levels who bought various types of clothing obviously reflects great need and indicates a tremendous potential market for clothing (Appendix table 30). The fact that not all men at the upper income levels purchased the various items probably indicates simply that some buy in such large quantities that they do not need to make replacements every year. The figures for the husbands in low-income families were far below the annual clothing requirements suggested in the WPA budget for an emergency standard of living.⁹ For example, while an annual replace-

⁹ Margaret Loomis Stecker, *Quantity Budgets for Basic Maintenance and Emergency Standards of Living*, Research Bulletin Series I, No. 21, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1936, p. 15.

Table 55. - Average Expenditure for Clothing of Husbands and Wives in Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Family type *M.*, Income, and Color, 1935-36

Family type and income	North Carolina-South Carolina						Atlanta, Ga.					
	sharecroppers			White			Negro			White		
	Husbands	Wives	\$	Husbands	Wives	\$	Husbands	Wives	\$	Husbands	Wives	\$
All groups	\$18	\$15		\$26	\$24		\$26	\$30		\$70	\$76	
Family type I	21	20		31	34		31	38		83	99	
II-III	20	17		32	29		23	26		72	73	
IV-V	17	14		21	18		26	29		58	61	
VI-VII	16	13		22	18		19	19		-	-	
Less than \$500	14	11		16	14		9	9		-	-	
Family type I	17	14		(17)	(20)		10	12		-	-	
II-III	16	14		20	17		11	9		-	-	
IV-V	11	8		(10)	(10)		6	6		-	-	
VI-VII	10	9		13	9		5	5		-	-	
\$500 - \$999	19	16		25	22		24	27		28	26	
Family type I	27	26		31	33		30	36		(37)	(38)	
II-III	24	20		0	26		21	23		26	23	
IV-V	17	15		19	17		22	26		23	19	
VI-VII	17	13		19	14		17	16		-	-	
\$1,000-\$1,999	23	20		32	29		40	46		47	45	
Family type I	t	t		(45)	(56)		51	68		49	60	
II-III	t	t		41	35		38	53		53	45	
IV-V	23	20		26	22		36	36		36	29	
VI-VII	23	18		26	24		30	30		-	-	
\$1,500-\$1,999	26	24		33	30		65	73		60	60	
\$2,000-\$2,999	-	-		-	-		63	72		79	88	
\$3,000 or more	-	-		-	-		(113)	(155)		132	161	

t Fewer than 10 cases.

a/ For a description of family types, see p. 80.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 10 to 25 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. III, Tabular Summary, Table 4; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 485, Tables 37 and 48.

ment of one cotton work shirt and one other shirt with attached collar and purchase of a wool work shirt every other year is suggested, it appears that one-third of the Negro men at the lowest income level and almost one-fifth of the white and Negro men at the next level bought no shirts at all during the year. Likewise, in contrast to the annual purchase of two pairs of work shoes and one pair of oxfords suggested in the emergency budget, work shoes were purchased barely every other year, on the average; two-thirds of the Negro men in families with incomes below \$500 bought no street shoes, and approximately one-third of the white and Negro men at the next income level failed to purchase any during the year of the study.

While it is obvious that the frequency of purchase would be lower among Negro than white men, because of their lower economic level, in respect to almost all types of clothing, this would probably not be true with respect to such articles as work shoes and overalls. The difference in the occupational status of Negro and white men, even at corresponding income levels, was reflected in the fact that while the proportion of white men who purchased work shoes declined rapidly with income this was not true in the case of Negroes. Similarly, the purchase of ties was much less common among Negroes than whites in families with similar incomes.

When the data for wives were examined, no such differences between whites and Negroes in similar income groups as appeared in the purchases of their husbands were found (Appendix table 30). The relatively small number of wives at low income levels that reported the purchase of most of the items, however, provides additional evidence of the tremendous unmet clothing needs. While it is true that numbers of Negro women were domestic servants and probably received some clothing from their employers, this does not mean that their clothing needs were met. It must also be recognized that most of the Negro families at the low income levels customarily live at those levels, whereas many of the white families in corresponding groups had higher incomes in the past and have some likelihood of obtaining them again.

PERSONAL CARE

Expenditures for personal care were small in amount and comprised, on the average, only 1 to 2 per cent of the total expenditures of white and Negro farm families and 2 to 3 per cent of the expenditures of nonfarm families of both races. The absolute amounts

spent by all nonrelief families on the average in certain communities on personal care were as follows:¹⁰

Community or community group	Barbershop and beauty-parlor service		Toilet articles and preparations	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
Georgia-Mississippi farm operators.....	\$ 2.47	\$ 8.80	\$ 3.85	\$ 9.65
Atlanta, Ga.....	10.10	19.50	12.80	24.20
New York, N. Y.....	19.50	29.00	16.20	21.80

Expenses for barbershop and beauty-parlor services at given income levels more often than not were somewhat higher for Negro than white families in urban areas. Negro families in Atlanta in the \$1,000-\$1,499 income group, for instance, averaged \$16.20 for this purpose in comparison with \$13.50 for whites.¹¹ Amounts spent by women for personal services have increased rapidly since the advent of beauty parlors. Nevertheless, according to the findings of the Consumer Purchases Study, the family head characteristically spent more at the barbershop than his wife spent at the beauty parlor (Table 56). A possible exception was found among the high-income families. The expenditures of wives in large families were particularly low.

Race differences in the use of beauty-parlor and barbershop services and of certain toilet articles were more apparent when the number of users rather than the average expense was considered. Only one-fifth of the Negro wives as compared with about two-thirds of the white wives in villages and small cities spent anything for beauty-parlor services (Appendix table 31). Over two-fifths of the Negro village families and approximately one-fourth of the Negro families in small cities failed to report expenses for dentifrices, while all but 7 and 3 per cent, respectively, of the white families reported some expense of this sort. The potential market for various items of personal care is much greater in the case of Negroes than of whites, and for both groups it is much greater in farm than nonfarm areas.

¹⁰ U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. III, Tabular Summary, Table 3; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 455, Table 12.

¹¹ U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. III, Tabular Summary, Table 3.

Table 56. - Average Expenditure by Husbands for Barbershop Services and by Wives for Beauty-parlor Services in Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Family Type, $\$$ / Income, and Color, 1935-36

Family type and income	Georgia-Mississippi farm operators				Atlanta, Ga.				Columbus, Ohio			
	Negro		White		Negro		White		Negro		White	
	Husbands	Wives	Husbands	Wives	Husbands	Wives	Husbands	Wives	Husbands	Wives	Husbands	Wives
All groups	\$1.30	\$0.50	\$ 3.70	\$ 2.20	\$ 5.10	\$ 2.70	\$ 7.50	\$ 7.00	\$ 6.80	\$3.90	\$ 7.80	\$ 7.00
Family type I	1.40	1.00	4.40	3.00	5.60	3.50	9.10	9.60	7.00	3.80	8.40	9.00
II-III	1.50	.50	8.80	3.80	4.90	2.10	7.30	6.70	6.50	3.30	7.70	6.90
IV-V	1.50	.40	10.90	4.00	4.90	2.80	6.40	5.30	6.50	4.10	7.50	6.00
VI-VII50	.	4.10	1.50	5.00	1.20	-	-	-	-	6.00	3.70
Less than \$50080	.10	.90	.40	2.90	.70	-	-	(4.80)	(1.00)	-	-
\$500-\$999	1.40	.60	2.10	.80	5.20	2.20	4.30	1.70	5.80	2.20	4.60	1.50
\$1,000-\$1,499	2.70	1.50	3.60	1.50	6.30	5.50	6.00	4.30	7.70	5.30	6.30	3.80
\$1,500-\$1,999	-	-	4.50	2.30	7.30	5.00	7.10	5.50	7.80	5.90	7.10	5.90
\$2,000-\$2,999	-	-	7.00	3.90	7.60	5.00	7.80	7.60	(10.60)	(11.10)	8.90	8.30
\$3,000 or more	-	-	13.30	12.20	(13.60)	(13.20)	12.30	16.40	-	-	11.40	15.60

*Less than \$0.05.

a/ For a description of family types, see p. 80.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 10 to 25 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. III, Tabular Summary, Table 3; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 455, Table 12, and unpublished data.

TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION

With the widespread ownership of automobiles, transportation has come to assume an important place in the budgets of American families. Except among such poor groups as southern sharecroppers, average expenditures for transportation¹² generally rank next in importance after those for food, shelter, and clothing. This is ordinarily true among Negroes as well as whites, although the former spend much less, on the average, than the latter for transportation, since such expenditures are closely related to income level (Table 57).

The lower transportation outlays of Negro than white families reflect mainly their less frequent ownership of automobiles. In Atlanta and the small southern cities surveyed less than one-fifth of the nonrelief normal Negro families reported ownership of cars during 1935-36 as compared with almost two-thirds of the corresponding white families (Table 58). For both racial groups automobile ownership was somewhat more common in Columbus than in southern cities, but in New York it was much lower. Ownership was more widespread among farm operators than among families in southern cities. Thus automobile ownership appeared to be inversely related to the size of the community.¹³ This was probably due to the fact that automobile operation tends to be more expensive in large cities than in smaller communities as a result of higher parking and garage charges¹⁴ and also less necessary as public transportation facilities are more adequate. The striking fact revealed by the data in Table 58 is that the proportion of owners was much lower among Negro than white families in any given community or group of communities even at corresponding income levels. This finding, which may seem somewhat surprising, is substantiated by the results of an independent study in which all groups of families were sampled.¹⁵ It is probable that Negroes face greater

¹² Includes amounts spent for the operation and purchase of an automobile and for all other travel and transportation other than for business purposes. The automobile not only serves as a method of transportation but also has well-defined social and recreational uses. Since it would have been impractical to ask the families covered in the Consumer Purchases Study to separate the amounts spent for utilitarian and social purposes, the figures cover all expenditures for family use of the automobile.

¹³ This was found to be characteristic of all regions of the United States. See U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. VI.

¹⁴ See U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. VI, Tabular Summary, Table 5.

¹⁵ Information regarding the ownership of automobiles in 1933 by Negro and white families at different income levels was obtained in the Financial Survey of

Table 57.—Average Expenditure and Proportion of Total Expenditures of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Transportation, by Income and Color, 1935-36

Income	Georgia—				Four small southern cities a/				Atlanta, Ga.		Columbus, Ohio		New York, N. Y.	
	Mississippi counties		Share-		Negro		White		Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
	Farm operators	White	Farm operators	White	Negro	White	Negro	White						
Average expenditure for transportation	\$21	\$98	\$10	\$11	\$33	\$150	\$53	\$203	\$73	\$196	\$66	\$163		
All incomes.	6	16	5	5	3	12	8	—	(6)	—	—	—	—	—
Less than \$500.	20	41	23	16	36	38	38	35	12	38	30	26	30	48
\$500-\$999.	73	87	—	—	91	96	99	110	84	102	49	48	80	93
\$1,000-\$1,499.	—	—	—	—	—	172	177	187	170	164	—	—	197	188
\$1,500-\$1,999(\$2,249) b/	—	—	—	—	—	244	159	254	224	258	—	—	—	367
\$2,000(\$2,250) b/-\$2,999	—	234	—	—	—	336	(441)	438	—	406	—	—	—	—
\$3,000 or more.	—	405	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Transportation expenditure as per cent of total expenditures	3.6	8.6	2.4	1.9	5.6	9.6	6.2	9.9	7.6	10.9	4.4	6.3	—	—
All incomes.	1.6	3.4	1.5	1.1	0.9	2.5	1.7	—	(1.3)	—	—	—	—	—
Less than \$500.	3.1	5.4	3.6	2.2	5.3	4.7	5.0	3.9	5.3	4.4	3.0	2.4	—	—
\$500-\$999.	8.1	7.6	—	—	9.3	7.7	8.2	8.3	7.9	8.3	—	—	—	—
\$1,000-\$1,499.	—	—	—	—	—	10.2	10.5	10.1	12.0	10.3	—	—	—	—
\$1,500-\$1,999(\$2,249) b/	—	9.8	—	—	15.6	10.5	10.5	10.5	12.3	12.3	—	—	—	—
\$2,000(\$2,250) b/-\$2,999	—	12.4	—	—	—	11.5	8.0	10.5	12.3	12.3	—	—	—	—
\$3,000 or more.	—	11.8	—	—	—	11.1	(14.5)	10.8	—	12.8	—	—	—	—

t Fewer than 10 cases.

a/ Albany, Ga.; Gastonia, N. C.; Sumter S. C.; and Griffin, Ga.

b/ For Atlanta, Columbus, and New York, the income classes are \$1,500-\$2,249 and \$2,250-\$2,999.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 10 to 25 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletins No. 643, 644, and 647, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Table 2; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 396, Tables 38 and 40, Miscellaneous Publication No. 466, Tables 35 and 40, and unpublished data.

Table 58.- Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Owning Automobiles, by Income and Color, 1935-36

Race and Income	Per cent of families owning automobiles								
	Georgia-Mississippi Counties		North Carolina-South Carolina Counties		Four small Southern Cities ^a		Atlanta, Ga.	Columbus, Ohio	New York, N.Y.
	Farm Operators	Share-croppers	Farm Operators	Share-croppers	Southern Cities ^a				
Negro									
All incomes	25	15	42	35	18	17	29	9	
Less than \$500	15	10	24	18	7	3	t	-	
\$500-\$999	26	24	43	41	20	13	20	2	
\$1,000-\$1,499	50	-	63	68	42	33	36	6	
\$1,500-\$1,999	-	-	t	-	t	55	49	10	
\$2,000-\$2,999	-	-	-	-	-	53	t	25	
\$3,000-or more	-	-	-	-	-	75	-	44	
White									
All incomes	62	20	71	45	64	63	74	38	
Less than \$500	36	12	26	18	21	-	-	-	
\$500-\$999	50	25	49	38	44	26	44	6	
\$1,000-\$1,499	74	-	74	57	64	48	65	12	
\$1,500-\$1,999	83	-	87	81	80	62	74	29	
\$2,000-\$2,999	91	-	93	-	90	77	84	46	
\$3,000-or more	98	-	99	-	95	86	92	60	

t Fewer than 25 cases.

^a Albany, Ga.; Gastonia, N. C.; Sumter, S. C.; and Griffin, Ga.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. VI, Tabular Summary, Table 3; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 415, Table 29.

difficulties than whites in obtaining installment credit. Practically all low-income families buy used cars, and this difficulty may be particularly great when purchasing from secondhand dealers rather than through regular automobile financing companies. It is possible also that automobile salesmen have not been fully aware of the potentialities of the Negro market. Furthermore, it may be that Negroes have less interest than whites in owning a car for purposes of week-end trips or vacations, since parks and resorts are frequently closed to Negroes or Negroes are at least unwelcome.

There were, however, no consistent differences between Negroes and whites at given income levels in the proportion that purchased cars during the year 1935-36. The ratio of purchasers to owners, which constitutes a rough measure of the replacement rate, tended, on the other hand, to be greater among Negroes than whites with similar incomes. It seems probable that this reflects not a normally higher replacement rate among Negroes but rather the fact that Negroes had postponed replacement during the depression of the thirties longer than whites¹⁶ and that many Negroes were buying automobiles for the first time. If this is true, the greater prevalence of automobile ownership among whites than among Negroes in corresponding groups may be more a reflection of depression conditions and their more severe effect on Negroes than on whites than a difference that would obtain at all stages in the business cycle.

In spite of the fact that Negroes have fewer automobiles than whites with similar incomes, a large number of low-income Negro families do own automobiles. At least a few of the urban families with incomes too low to cover the cost of the emergency level budget (see pp. 84-88) operated automobiles of some sort during 1935-36. Among farm families 10-24 per cent of the Negroes with incomes below \$500 and 12-36 per cent of the corresponding whites reported automobile ownership (Table 58). Raper, commenting upon

Urban Housing. While this information (U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, *Consumer Use of Selected Goods and Services, by Income Classes*, Market Research Series, No. 5, Washington, 1935-37) reveals racial differences that seem unreasonably great, if the income classification can be trusted, it is nevertheless of interest to note that it confirms the Consumer Purchases Study on this point. In Birmingham, Ala., for example, 10.0 per cent of all Negro families in the \$500-\$999 income class owned automobiles in comparison with 44.1 per cent of white families at the same income level. Comparable figures for Columbia, S. C., were 16.9 and 41.1 per cent, respectively.

¹⁶ U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. VI, Tabular Summary, Tables 3 and 4; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 415, Tables 39 and 40.

Table 59. - Average Expenditure and Proportion of Total Expenditures of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Medical Care, by Family Type ^{a/}, Income, and Color, 1935-36

Family type and income	Georgia-Mississippi counties				34 southern villages		Atlanta, Ga.		New York, N. Y.	
	Farm operators		Share-croppers		Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
	Negro	White	Negro	White						
Average expenditure for medical care										
All groups	\$18	\$51	\$12	\$20	\$24	\$72	\$44	\$110	\$44	\$114
Family type I	17	52	9	20	23	60	45	127	44	95
II-III	16	42	11	20	23	70	41	94	37	116
IV-V	21	62	13	18	24	80	48	111	53	130
VI-VII	16	33	14	19	27	70	38	-	-	-
Less than \$500	11	15	9	15	17	21	19	-	-	-
\$500-\$999	21	30	18	22	31	39	42	30	25	19
\$1,000-\$1,499	44	-	-	-	43	46	61	50	34	56
\$1,500-\$1,999 (\$2,249) ^{b/}	-	43	-	-	-	72	86	90	56	86
\$2,000 (\$2,250) ^{b/} -\$2,999	-	97	-	-	-	111	96	146	85	114
\$3,000 or more	-	212	-	-	-	165	(134)	253	6	224
Medical care expenditures as per cent of total expenditures										
All groups	3.1	4.5	2.9	3.4	4.4	4.5	5.1	5.3	2.9	4.4
Family type I	3.6	5.4	2.8	4.0	4.3	4.2	5.7	6.5	3.1	4.0
II-III	2.9	3.9	2.9	3.7	4.5	4.6	5.2	4.9	2.6	4.8
IV-V	3.2	4.6	2.7	2.7	3.9	4.4	5.1	4.9	3.0	4.5
VI-VII	2.6	3.5	2.9	2.9	5.1	4.9	4.2	-	-	-
Less than \$500	2.8	3.2	2.8	3.5	4.4	4.2	4.2	-	-	-
\$500-\$999	3.2	4.0	2.8	3.1	4.4	4.7	5.5	3.4	2.5	1.7
\$1,000-\$1,499	3.5	3.8	-	-	3.7	3.6	5.1	3.8	2.6	4.1
\$1,500-\$1,999 (\$2,249) ^{b/}	-	3.1	-	-	-	4.3	5.1	4.8	3.1	4.5
\$2,000 (\$2,250) ^{b/} -\$2,999	-	5.1	-	-	-	4.9	4.8	6.0	3.6	4.4
\$3,000 or more	-	6.2	-	-	-	5.0	(4.4)	6.3	6	4.6

t Fewer than 10 cases.

^{a/} For a description of family types, see p. 80.

^{b/} For Atlanta and New York, the income classes are \$1,500-\$2,249 and \$2,250-\$2,999.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 23 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletins No. 643 and 647, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Table 2; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 396, Tables 38, 40, and 61, Miscellaneous Publication No. 465, Tables 36, 40, and 46, and unpublished data.

the economic problems of southern farm tenants, pointed out that "Most tenants, already convinced that they got 'nothin' but a livin'' anyway, put whatever money they have into automobiles, or phonographs, or a short period of 'high livin',' or more sensibly into family necessities—food, clothing, schoolbooks."¹⁷ On the other hand, it must be recognized that many farm families are virtually isolated without an automobile.

MEDICAL CARE

The unmet health needs of large sectors of the population constitute one of the most serious problems in the United States today. In general, average family expenditures for all medical services, medicines, and health and accident insurance appear to be rather small, particularly in view of the fact that public-health provisions for free or semifree services meet but a small part of the need and are still nonexistent in many rural areas. In the Georgia and Mississippi counties sampled, expenditures for medical care averaged only \$12 and \$18 for Negro sharecroppers and farm operators, respectively, and \$20 and \$51 for white sharecroppers and farm operators (Table 59). In cities expenditures were considerably higher. In both Atlanta and New York the general average outlay by Negroes was \$44 and that by whites about two and one-half times as much. These expenditures constituted from 3 per cent to slightly more than 5 per cent of the total expenditures of the various family groups.

The number of members in the family appeared to have little influence on the average amounts spent for these essential services. This means that the medical care received by members of the larger families was even more inadequate than that received by smaller families. Moreover, since large families contain, on the average, more children than small families, it may be that children receive less care than adults. In the various communities studied, families belonging to types VI and VII, those with the most children, had the lowest per capita expenditures for medical care, while families consisting of husband and wife only (type I) had the highest expenditures (Table 60).

With increases in income there is a fairly marked expansion in average outlays for medical care, although there is no consistent tendency toward an increase in the proportion of total expenditures used for this purpose (Appendix table 32). The rise with income in the amounts spent for medical attention is in striking contrast to

¹⁷ Arthur F. Raper, *Preface to Peasantry*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1936, p. 159.

Table 80.—Per Capita Expenditures for Medical Care in Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Family Type *a/* and Color, 1935-36

Family type	Georgia-Mississippi farm operators		34 southern villages		Atlanta, Ga.	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
All groups	\$5	\$13	\$7	\$20	\$13	\$12
Family type I ...	8	25	11	30	22	64
II-III ...	5	12	7	20	12	27
IV-V ...	5	14	6	19	12	25
VI-VII ...	2	5	4	12	6	-

a/ For a description of family types, see p. 80.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. V, Tabular Summary, Table 3; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 402, Table 35.

the tendency for serious illness to strike the lower income groups more heavily than the higher income groups.¹⁸

Average figures, while useful as a rough measure of the amounts spent for medical care by families in different income groups, do not indicate the actual burden of medical-care expense. Data for Atlanta families during 1935-36 reveal that there are some families at almost every income level that spend nothing or only very small amounts for medical care, whereas serious illness forces other families to incur large bills (Appendix table 32). Even among families

¹⁸ Data collected in the National Health Survey for 2,308,588 persons in 81 cities in 1935-36 indicate that the annual frequency of illness, both acute and chronic, that is disabling for at least one week is inversely related to economic status. This is shown by the following figures (U. S. Public Health Service, Preliminary Reports, *The National Health Survey, 1935-1936*, Sickness and Medical Care Series, Bulletin No. 2, Washington, 1938, p. 2):

Annual family income and relief status	Frequency rate of disabling illnesses per 1,000 persons in a 12-month period
All incomes.....	172
Relief families.....	234
Nonrelief families.....	
Less than \$1,000.....	174
\$1,000-\$1,999.....	155
\$2,000-\$2,999.....	150
\$3,000 or more.....	149

Data collected by the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care for a somewhat earlier date show a similar inverse relationship between income and severity of illness. The findings for approximately 6,500 wage earners aged 15-64 years of both sexes (G. St. J. Perrott in "The State of the Nation's Health," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 188, November, 1936, p. 141) are as follows:

Annual family income	Days of disability per disabling case per year
Less than \$1,200.....	24.7
\$1,200-\$1,999.....	15.4
\$2,000-\$2,999.....	13.9
\$3,000 or more.....	11.2

with moderate incomes medical bills of several hundred dollars may mean marked disruptions of the family economy. At low-income levels the results are even more serious, since families are unlikely to have savings on which to draw and their already inadequate food, housing, and clothing budgets prevent any reduction of regular running expenses. Because of their concentration at the low-income levels, this situation is particularly serious for Negro families.

Although some families at every income level go through a year without illness, it seems highly unlikely that nearly 30 per cent of the Negro families in Atlanta with incomes below \$250 and 15 per cent of those with incomes of \$250-\$499 were so fortunate. Moreover, 17 per cent and 15 per cent, respectively, made expenditures for medicine and drugs only. At the two succeeding income levels (\$500-\$749 and \$750-\$999), 13 per cent and 10 per cent, respectively, of the Negro families in Atlanta and 34 per cent and 23 per cent of the white families reported no medical-care expenditures other than for medicine and drugs.¹⁹

Data on the distribution of southern farm and village families according to their expenditures for medical care indicate that the proportions which made no expenditures at all during the year were considerably smaller than in Atlanta. They were higher for sharecroppers, both white and Negro, than for farm operator or village families.²⁰

It is impossible to estimate to what extent medical needs were met by free care. Substantial numbers of low-income Negro and white families in Atlanta and New York reported some free medical care during 1935-36,²¹ but southern farm and village families rarely benefited from such service (Appendix table 33). Despite the lower income level of nonrelief Negro than white families, the relative number that received any free care during 1935-36 was even lower among Negro than white families in the rural South. This is in sharp contrast to the situation in Atlanta and New York, where

¹⁹ U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. V, p. 9.

²⁰

<i>Community group</i>	<i>Per cent of families reporting no expenditures</i>	
	<i>Negro</i>	<i>White</i>
Georgia-Mississippi counties		
Farm operators.....	2	2
Sharecroppers.....	6	5
34 southern villages.....	4	2

See U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 402, Table 34.

²¹ "It is probable that some of these families received no more than routine health treatments while others received extensive care and even hospitalization. . . . It is not known how frequently 'free care' was interpreted to include, for example, physical examination of children in school" (U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. VI, p. 10).

approximately two and one-half times as large a proportion of Negro nonrelief families as of white nonrelief families received some free care.

Average expenditures for all types of medical care not only fail to represent the general level of spending by different groups of families but also conceal marked differences between Negroes and whites in spending patterns. While whites spent substantially more, on the average, than Negroes for medical care in general, race differences in amounts spent for medical services were much larger.²² Thus, for the services of physicians, dentists, oculists, and other specialists, for hospitalization and for nursing, in combination, the average expenditures of Negro farm operators in Georgia and Mississippi in 1935-36 were less than \$10 as against \$40 for white farm operators. Corresponding figures for Negroes and whites were \$12 and \$58 in Columbia and Mobile, \$10 and \$82 in Atlanta, and \$22 and \$60 in Columbus. At comparable income levels below \$1,000 the expenditures of Negro families for these varied services averaged about half as much as those of white families. Negroes likewise tended to spend less than whites for medicines, drugs, eyeglasses, and other medical supplies, but the differences were usually smaller. Average payments for health and accident insurance, on the other hand, both in general and at given income levels were much larger among Negro than white families.

Most of the small average expenditures for medical services by Negro families went to a general physician. Even so, relatively large numbers made no expenditure for a physician during the year of the study (Appendix table 34). Dental care was reported by relatively few Negro families. The rapid rise with increased income in the proportion of families reporting expenses for dental care suggests that this is considered something of a luxury. The differences between Negro and white families were considerably larger with respect to the proportion reporting outlays for dental care than with respect to the relative number that had expenditures for a physician.

Both the proportion of families having health or accident insurance and the average payments by families having such insurance were higher among Negroes than whites in rural and urban areas of the Southeast (Appendix table 35). It is probable that this reflects in part the more common practice among Negroes than whites of joining fraternal lodges that offer health as well as burial insurance.

It is obvious that only under an insurance scheme could the

²² U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. V, Tabular Summary, Table C; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 402, Table 35.

uneven financial risks of illness, which the data reveal, be eliminated. Moreover, the average amounts now spent for medical care would be sufficient to provide adequate care even among the families with moderate incomes only if it were purchased on a group rather than an individual basis. The annual cost of adequate medical care (exclusive of dental care, community services, medicines, and appliances) for the population of the United States with the age distribution which prevailed in 1930 has been estimated at about \$76 per person when services are purchased on an individual basis.²³ It is believed that when medical care is purchased by groups, \$17.50 per person per year constitutes a reasonable minimum estimate of the cost of adequate medical care (both curative and preventive), exclusive of dental care,²⁴ and that an additional \$7.50 per person per year would provide adequate dental care.²⁵

While these estimates of average costs are not entirely applicable to every particular small group of families, it is nevertheless of interest to contrast them with the average annual per person expenditures for medical care by Negro and white families of different types at different income levels for a few selected communities (Table 59 and p. 149). Even when purchased on the relatively inexpensive group basis, it appears that at present average rates of spending Negroes and whites could afford adequate care only when two-person families had incomes of at least \$1,000 to \$1,500 a year and when larger families had progressively higher incomes.²⁶ There can be little doubt that the present average outlays, which represent large expenditures by a few and small expenditures by the many, do not afford the care that is desirable for a healthy population to most of the Negro and many of the white families studied. Moreover, it

²³ Estimates of the need for medical care were based on studies of the incidence of illness; estimates of the amount and kind of services required were prepared according to the sample opinions of medical men. Average costs were generally computed according to the current schedule of minimum fees for services rendered, as shown in the 1933-34 Blue Book of the Chicago Medical Society. (See Roger I. Lee and Lewis W. Jones, *The Fundamentals of Good Medical Care*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1933, Chap. I; and Samuel Bradbury, *The Cost of Adequate Medical Care*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1937, especially pp. 52-53.)

²⁴ This figure was based on the experience of various organized medical-service and insurance plans. (See Interdepartmental Committee to Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities, *Proceedings of the National Health Conference, July, 1938*, "Report of the Technical Committee on Medical Care," Washington, 1938, p. 57.)

²⁵ *Idem*.

²⁶ See U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. V, Chap. III, for a discussion of the adequacy of spending for medical care by urban families in various sections of the United States and Tabular Summary, Table 3. See also U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 402, Table 35.

is evident that even under a group-payment plan, with the cost of medical services paid for in regular, relatively small installments, the great majority of Negro families, particularly those with many children, would under present circumstances be unable to bear the full cost of adequate care without public assistance. Under the present system the overwhelming majority of the Negro population apparently is economically unable to meet its medical needs.

RECREATION AND LEISURE-TIME ACTIVITIES

The earlier point of view that recreational activities are nonessential for families with small incomes has almost completely given way to a more realistic appreciation of the general importance of recreation for mental and physical health and development. Also it is more and more widely recognized that free recreational facilities, such as parks, playgrounds, swimming pools, and libraries, are particularly needed by families living in crowded slum quarters, where there otherwise is not space enough for the children to play, where traffic hazards often are serious, where the means for buying commercial entertainment is always meager, and where there is generally too little opportunity for leisure-time activities which are considered desirable. Negroes, at least in the South, usually have less opportunity than whites to make use of existing recreational facilities. Therefore, when comparing the expenses for recreational purposes of Negro and white families, it should be kept in mind that in many cases Negroes have to pay more than whites in order to achieve the same level of consumption in regard to this particular item.

When expenditures for reading, tobacco,²⁷ movies and other types of performances, games and sports equipment, and other types of recreation (exclusive of food used when entertaining and food and lodging when on vacation or trips) were combined, the general average expenditures were found to be of roughly the same size as those for medical care except in New York, where they were substantially larger (Table 61). Negroes spent less than whites for recreation both in general and at corresponding income levels. In the Georgia and Mississippi counties sampled, Negro sharecroppers and farm operators spent on the average only \$15 and \$17, respectively, during the year; whites, \$18 and \$46. At the other extreme, in New York, the average expenditure was \$90 for Negro families and \$166 for white families.

Family size appeared to have little influence on such expenditures, indicating that large families either limit their recreational activities

²⁷ Tobacco has been included in this group for the sake of convenience.

Table 61. Average Expenditure of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Reading, Tobacco, and Other Recreational Activities, by Family Type, a/ Income, and Color, 1935-36

Family type and income	Georgia-Mississippi counties								34 southern villages				Atlanta, Ga.		New York, N. Y.		
	Farm operators				Sharecroppers				Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White									
All groups	\$17	\$46	\$15	\$18	\$27	\$90	\$44	\$119	\$90	\$166							
Family type I	14	39	11	18	27	84	38	111	88	168							
II-III	17	54	14	18	25	94	38	121	79	151							
IV-V	18	52	17	20	30	93	56	122	108	184							
VI-VII	16	29	16	17	22	83	42	-	-	-							
Less than \$500	13	16	13	16	17	19	19	-	-	-							
\$500-\$999	18	25	20	21	37	46	39	52	39	50							
\$1,000-\$1,499	26	32	-	-	66	74	55	74	73	80							
\$1,500-\$1,999 (\$2,249) ^b /	-	54	-	-	-	100	78	110	122	124							
\$2,000 (\$2,250) ^b /-\$2,999	-	92	-	-	-	127	112	133	154	167							
\$3,000 or more	-	172	-	-	-	187	(194)	236	t	331							

t Fewer than 10 cases.

^a/ For a description of family types; see p. 80.

^b/ For Atlanta and New York, the income classes are \$1,500-\$2,249 and \$2,250-\$2,999.

Note: The figure in parentheses is based on 23 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. VII, Tabular Summary, Tables 3, 4, and 6; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 396, Tables 40 and 51, and Miscellaneous Publication No. 465, Tables 35 and 46.

more than small families or confine them more carefully to types which involve little or no expense. Variations in income, on the other hand, had a rather pronounced influence on the size of these expenditures. This increase with income in recreational expenditures reflected a tendency not for each type of expenditure to increase in relative importance but rather for additional types of recreation to be indulged in.

Tobacco was the most important expense in the list of items for both Negro and white families in all community groups (Appendix table 36). Moreover, in most cases the differences between the general average outlays of whites and Negroes were smaller for tobacco than for any of the other types of recreational expense analyzed. This was due to the fact that expenditures for tobacco showed a somewhat less pronounced tendency to increase with income than the other specified types of recreation.

Outlays for reading matter were small, averaging for Negro families only \$1 per year among sharecroppers in Georgia and Mississippi, \$2 among farm operators in the same counties, \$3 in the southern villages, \$10 in Atlanta (barely enough to provide one three-cent newspaper per day), and \$16 in New York. Although whites spent more for reading, the amounts ranged only from \$2 among sharecroppers to \$27 in New York. These small average expenditures for reading reflect the fact that very little was spent for books or magazines²⁸ and that considerable numbers of families, at least in the southern rural areas and small cities, reported no expenditures even for newspapers (daily or weekly) during the entire year of the study. The proportions of nonrelief families in these communities that reported the purchase of newspapers were as follows:²⁹

Color	Per cent of families reporting purchase of newspapers					
	Georgia-Mississippi counties		North Carolina-South Carolina counties		34 southern villages	Four small southern cities
	Farm operators	Share-croppers	Farm operators	Share-croppers		
Negro.....	38	16	36	21	42	47
White.....	75	41	73	41	88	92

²⁸ See U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. VII, Chap. III; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 456, Table 22.

²⁹ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 456, Table 22.

Thus the relative number of families that reported expenditures for newspapers was nearly twice as large among whites as Negroes. This, however, seems to be due to differences in income, as there was no consistent race differential at given income levels but pronounced differences between income groups.

The differences between the average expenditures of Negroes and whites tended to be even greater for other recreational items than for reading or tobacco. Among rural Negroes and white sharecroppers, expenditures for movies and other commercial entertainment (fairs, dances, plays, concerts, spectator sports), for games and sports equipment, and for other types of paid recreation (including toys, club dues, pets, purchase and upkeep of radios and musical instruments) were negligible. For both whites and Negroes in rural areas opportunities for participation in these largely urbanized forms of recreation are limited, with Negroes even more handicapped than whites. Even in urban areas, however, the race differences remained large. The tendency, at least in the South, for Negroes to spend less for movies than whites with corresponding incomes may reflect the fact that Negroes are usually excluded from the more expensive theaters or are segregated in the balcony.

Data from the Consumer Purchases Study as to the prevalence of radios, phonographs, and pianos in the homes of the families studied indicate that most Negro farm families had nothing in their homes to compensate for the lack of outside recreation.³⁰ Ownership of radios and pianos was negligible. Phonographs were more common, but even they were reported by a maximum of 30 per cent of the Negro farm operators in North Carolina and South Carolina. Proportionately more white farm families had radios and, in the case

30

Community Group	Per cent of families reporting ownership of specified equipment					
	Negro			White		
	Radio	Phonograph	Piano	Radio	Phonograph	Piano
Georgia-Mississippi counties						
Farm operators.....	2	22	5	31	26	19
Sharecroppers.....	*	17	1	7	22	2
North Carolina-South Carolina counties						
Farm operators.....	5	30	5	40	23	23
Sharecroppers.....	4	24	2	24	19	4

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

See U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 456, Table 24.

Table 62. Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Atlanta, Ga., and Columbus, Ohio, Reporting Ownership of Specified Equipment, by Income and Color, 1935-36

Income	Per cent of families reporting ownership of specified equipment									
	Atlanta, Ga.					Columbus, Ohio				
	Negro			White		Negro			White	
	Radio	Phono-graph	Piano	Radio	Phono-graph	Radio	Phono-graph	Piano	Radio	Phono-graph
All incomes	46	24	18	91	16	23	86	32	95	17
Less than \$500	17	29	10	-	-	-	t	35	-	-
\$500-\$999	43	22	14	69	16	5	80	35	88	10
\$1,000-\$1,499	72	26	27	90	12	17	92	29	93	16
\$1,500-\$1,999	91	16	56	94	13	19	91	30	95	17
\$2,000-\$2,999	96	17	64	95	16	26	100	68	98	20
\$3,000 or more	t	t	t	98	26	45	-	-	98	18

t Fewer than 25 cases.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. IV, Table 3.

of operators, pianos; but, even so, only 40 per cent of the white operators in the North Carolina and South Carolina counties reported radios. In view of the relatively high proportions of automobile owners among southern farm families (p. 144), it would appear that automobile riding constitutes a highly important form of recreation. Since Negroes owned automobiles less frequently than whites, they were more limited in respect to such recreation also. Radio ownership was much more common in Atlanta and Columbus than in farm areas for both whites and Negroes not only in general but also at corresponding income levels (Table 62).⁸¹ In Atlanta 46 per cent of the Negro families as against 91 per cent of the white families reported radios, while in Columbus the corresponding percentages were 86 and 95. When Negro families had incomes of \$1,500 or more in Atlanta and \$1,000 or more in Columbus, differences between Negroes and whites in regard to radio ownership became negligible. Race differences in the ownership of pianos were generally small with ownership in both groups increasing rapidly with income. In contrast, phonographs were reported more frequently by Negroes than by whites; moreover, ownership appeared to bear little relationship to income. Provision for recreation in the home thus seemed to be more extensive among urban than rural families for both Negro and white families.

FORMAL EDUCATION

The average amounts spent directly for education are small. They depend mainly on whether textbooks are furnished free, whether any special fees are charged, or whether tuition is paid for private lessons or advanced education.

The small average expenditures of Negroes for formal education attest to the fact that generally only small amounts were spent for books and school supplies and that few of the families sent their children to private schools or college or were able to provide special lessons in music or the like (Table 63). The average amounts spent directly for education by white families were also low during 1935-36, but they were several times as high as the amounts reported by Negroes. The number of children of school age in the family is the primary factor influencing direct expenditures for education, but the racial differences persisted in each family type. They were particularly pronounced in the case of large families.

The differences in the amounts spent for education by whites and

⁸¹ For data for farm families at different income levels, see U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 456, Table 24.

Table 65. -Average Expenditure of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Formal Education, by Family Type, a/ Income, and Color, 1935-36

Family type and income	Georgia-Mississippi counties										34 southern villages				Atlanta, Ga.		New York, N. Y.		
	Farm operators					Sharecroppers													
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	White
All groups	\$4	\$16	\$2	\$5	\$4	\$21	\$5	\$13	\$5	\$13	\$5	\$13	\$5	\$13	\$5	\$13	\$5	\$13	\$20
Family type I	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
II-III	3	7	2	2	3	6	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	1	15	1	15	15
IV-V	5	29	2	8	6	47	9	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	8	43	8	43	43
VI-VII	6	15	3	9	9	20	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less than \$500	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	13	0	13	13
\$500-\$999	5	8	3	6	5	6	7	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	3	6	0	6	6
\$1,000-\$1,499	6	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	10	0	10	10
\$1,500-\$1,999 (\$2,249) ^b /...	-	24	-	-	-	16	-	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	3	14	3	14	14
\$2,000(\$2,250) ^b /-\$2,999 ...	-	37	-	-	-	41	-	52	52	52	52	52	52	52	2	7	2	7	7
\$3,000 or more	-	58	-	-	-	73	-	(78)	(78)	(78)	(78)	(78)	(78)	(78)	4	74	4	74	74

* Less than \$0.50.

† Fewer than 10 cases.

a/ For a description of family types, see p. 80.

b/ For Atlanta and New York, the income classes are \$1,500-\$2,249 and \$2,250-\$2,999.

Note: The figure in parentheses is based on 23 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. VII, Tabular Summary, Table 5; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 396, Tables 40 and 51, and Miscellaneous Publication No. 465, Tables 35 and 46.

Negroes obviously reflected in the main the sharp rise in such expenses at the high income levels, where the number of Negroes even in cities was negligible but where considerable numbers of whites were found. In Atlanta this difference in the expenditures of Negroes and whites was attributable entirely to the lower incomes of Negro families, since at every comparable income level Negroes made larger average outlays for education than whites. The same situation was found in Columbia and Mobile.³² While in Atlanta the sample of Negroes included larger families than the sample for whites, this was not the case in the middle-sized southern cities. Moreover, both there and in Atlanta comparison of the expenditures made by families of the same type revealed higher expenditures by Negroes than whites with similar incomes.³³ This finding is difficult to interpret; it may be partly due to the fact that in the South children in Negro schools are less adequately supplied with books and other materials than children in white schools. It also partly reflects the low expenditures for education of white families in Atlanta as compared with other white groups analyzed.

GIFTS, CONTRIBUTIONS, AND PERSONAL TAXES

In addition to the goods and services which comprise the consumption of families, there are certain obligations which must be met: gifts to friends, support of relatives not members of the immediate family, contributions to church or other religious organizations, donations to charitable organizations or needy individuals, and direct personal taxes. Practically all families, even those living on a bare subsistence level, make some small gifts or contributions during the course of a year. Only a minority pay any direct taxes. Indirect taxes do not show up in the data from the Consumer Purchases Study since they were included in the expenses for the items to which they apply.³⁴

Average amounts spent for these items were fairly large in comparison with the average amounts for some of the minor categories of consumption previously considered. While white families spent considerably more in this way than Negro families, the differences were smaller than might be expected in view of the extremely rapid rise with income in expenditures of this sort (Table 64). That the race differences were no greater is attributable to the fact that

³² U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 647, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Table 2.

³³ *Idem.*

³⁴ Taxes on owned homes and on automobiles were likewise included in the expenses for those items.

Table 64. - Average Expenditure of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Contributions and Personal Taxes, by Family Type, a/ Income, and Color, 1935-36

Family type and income	Georgia-Mississippi counties						34 southern villages		Atlanta, Ga.		New York, N. Y.	
	Farm operators			Share- croppers			Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
	Negro	White	\$	Negro	White	\$						
All groups	\$11	\$38	\$6	\$5	\$74	\$29	\$92	\$128				
Family type I	11	40	6	6	89	36	117	154				
II-III	10	34	7	6	67	24	79	98				
IV-V	12	47	7	5	79	26	86	140				
VI-VII	7	12	4	3	42	20	-	-				
Less than \$500	7	6	4	3	7	8	-	-				
\$500-\$999	12	12	9	7	17	23	18	13				
\$1,000-\$1,499	18	27	-	-	39	48	36	20				
\$1,500-\$1,999 (\$2,249) <u>b</u> /	-	36	-	-	69	68	62	47				
\$2,000 (\$2,250) <u>b</u> /-\$2,999	-	66	-	-	122	107	107	89				
\$3,000 or more	-	236	-	-	265	(171)	283	407				

t Fewer than 10 cases.

a/ For a description of family types, see p. 80.

b/ For Atlanta and New York, the income classes are \$1,500-\$2,249 and \$2,250-\$2,999.

Note: The figure in parentheses is based on 23 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 649, Vol. VII, Tabular Summary, Table 7; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 396, Tables 40 and 51, and Miscellaneous Publication No. 465, Tables 35 and 46.

Negroes more often than not spent somewhat more for contributions of various sorts than whites with similar incomes.

The number of members in the family had an important influence on the size of the average outlays. The more persons there were to be clothed and fed the less there remained to be used for gifts and donations.

Outlays for the support of relatives and contributions to religious organizations generally made up the largest share of the total for this category of expense as illustrated by data for Atlanta (Table 65). Personal gifts tended to be next in importance, followed by personal taxes (poll, income, personal-property, and occupation taxes). Average amounts donated for welfare activities tended to be the smallest. The relative importance of these items undoubtedly varies from community to community. The amounts that must be paid out as personal taxes depend on the local tax system, the average size of contributions to the church and affiliated organizations reflects differences in the proportions of families that belong to the various religions groups, and donations to private welfare agencies depend on the adequacy of public relief and conversely on the existence and appeal of private agencies.

Despite these intercommunity variations, the proportionate differences in the average amounts spent by whites and by Negroes tended to be smallest in respect to church contributions and the support of relatives. At corresponding income levels Negroes tended to give somewhat larger sums than whites to the church. With regard to the support of relatives, the proportion of families that made such contributions was even more striking than the average amounts so spent (Table 65 and Appendix table 37). Among farm and village families the proportion reporting contributions toward the support of relatives was as high among all Negroes as among all whites or even higher. At corresponding income levels, with relatively few exceptions, a considerably larger proportion of Negroes than of whites made some contribution toward the support of their relatives. The same general relationships were found in New York and at most income levels in Atlanta and Columbus. This suggests that among low-income Negroes in particular help for indigent relatives persists as a social pattern more strongly than it does among whites. This may be due in part to the fact that Negro families with adequate or nearly adequate earnings are more likely than corresponding white families to have relatives who are not only worse off than they are but also in great need of assistance. Since the data refer only to normal nonrelief families, there is a population of relief families

Table 65. - Average Expenditure of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Atlanta, Ga., for Contributions and Personal Taxes, by Income and Color, 1935-36

Income	Support of relatives		Contributions to religious organizations		Personal gifts		Personal taxes		Other	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
All incomes	\$10.40	\$26.60	\$10.80	\$26.00	\$ 3.90	\$19.40	\$ 2.60	\$12.70	\$ 1.60	\$ 7.30
Less than \$500	1.90	-	3.40	-	0.70	-	1.20	-	0.30	-
\$500-\$999	8.30	5.90	9.00	4.00	2.20	2.90	2.10	4.10	1.10	1.00
\$1,000-\$1,499	19.30	11.50	17.50	10.10	6.20	7.20	3.30	5.90	1.90	1.90
\$1,500-\$1,999	5.00	15.00	27.40	17.90	16.50	12.70	4.80	7.40	3.90	3.70
\$2,000-\$2,999	24.90	30.20	34.30	29.20	26.60	19.80	9.60	10.20	6.00	7.50
\$3,000 or more	(43.60)	76.80	(43.00)	75.20	(38.00)	61.10	(18.40)	44.40	(28.10)	25.60

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 23 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. VII, Tabular Summary, Table 7.

and broken families below them on the economic scale which, in urban areas and particularly in the North, is proportionally much larger in the Negro than the white population. In the South, especially in rural areas, the need for private assistance must be larger in the Negro than the white group since it is usually more difficult for a Negro family than for a white family in similar economic circumstances to obtain public relief.⁸⁵

⁸⁵ See pp. 221-233.

Chapter IX

HOUSING CONDITIONS

Rural Housing

Housing conditions of both Negroes and whites vary considerably from rural-farm to rural-nonfarm to urban areas. Moreover, the available data on housing conditions are usually from surveys limited to one of these three broad residential classifications so that residence forms the logical basis for a comparative analysis of Negro and white housing.

RURAL-FARM HOUSING

Because the congested slum areas of cities leave a more vivid impression than scattered farmhouses and because the compact urban populations are more advantageously situated for collective action, most efforts to investigate and remedy poor housing conditions have been confined to cities. Furthermore, the northward migration of Negroes has produced a host of problems connected with the mutual adjustment of the city and the Negro, so that when the attention of the public has been directed toward Negro housing it has been focused on Negro urban slums. Yet the rural South is the most extensive residential area of Negroes, and housing conditions among rural Negroes are equally as serious as those in urban areas.

Prior to the 1930 census, which supplied rather meager data, a few scattered and limited studies of rural-farm housing had been made. They indicated that substandard conditions were widespread not only among Negroes but among whites as well.¹ In January, 1934, however, the first large-scale investigation of rural farm housing in the United States was undertaken.² Approximately 600,000 farmhouses in 308 counties of 46 states were investigated, consti-

¹ Charles S. Johnson, *Negro Housing*, The President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, Washington, 1932.

² See U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Home Economics, *The Farm-Housing Survey*, Miscellaneous Publication No. 323, Washington, 1939.

tuting 8.6 per cent of all occupied farmhouses reported for the surveyed states in the 1935 Census of Agriculture. The sample for the three southern divisions included over 320,000 dwelling units. In the South Atlantic states the sample covered 10.1 per cent of the occupied farm dwellings enumerated in the 1935 census; in the East South Central states, 7.8 per cent; and in the West South Central states, 7.8 per cent.³

The completeness of the survey varied from county to county with the data admittedly biased toward the more prosperous rural areas.⁴ This means that the serious housing deficiencies discovered do not completely portray the extent of poor rural housing. Also, many of the items included in the study were subjectively evaluated by the survey enumerators, but the picture presented checks so consistently with the objective items obtained that the general results must be considered more reliable than one would expect a priori.

The published data from the survey are not classified by race. These data are available on work sheets, however, and permission to utilize them was obtained from the Bureau of Home Economics of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Because of the time and expense involved, only the data for eleven southern states were assembled. They represent the only large sample of rural-farm housing materials available for both whites and Negroes and will remain so until the release of the results of the 1940 housing census, which will be less complete in many respects.

The most important survey affording supplementary data is the Consumer Purchases Study which collected data on farmhouses in the Southeast. This study covered native-born, nonrelief, normal farm families in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi.⁵

Structural Aspects of Rural-farm Housing

Because of the milder climate houses which would provide quite inadequate protection from cold weather in the North may be fit for habitation in the South. Even taking this into consideration, however, housing facilities are on the whole much less adequate in the rural South than in other rural sections. White farm families reside in inadequate dwellings more often in the South than in the North or West, while Negro farm families tend to live in the poorest

³ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁴ For an analysis of the bias in the sample, see the general report on the survey (*Ibid.*, pp. 34-35).

⁵ See Appendix A.

Table 66. - Proportion of Farmhouses with Specified Facilities, by Geographic Divisions, 1934

Item	United States	New England			East North Central			West North Central			South Atlantic			East South Central			West South Central			Pacific
		12,828	83,808	116,184	131,847	91,826	96,543	31,226	27,756	25,6	42,4	26,3	5,7	21,5	57,1	5,6	24,2	45,7	0,2	
Number of houses surveyed	595,855 a/	12,828	83,808	116,184	131,847	91,826	96,543	31,226	27,756	25,6	42,4	26,3	5,7	21,5	57,1	5,6	24,2	45,7	0,2	27,756
Per cent of farm houses																				
By age of house																				
Under 10 years	15.3	5.6	7.4	11.3	14.8	17.6	22.1	20.7	25.6											
10-24 years	29.9	6.7	17.0	27.4	30.6	31.5	37.6	47.3	42.4											
25-49 years	35.6	12.5	38.0	44.4	35.5	34.6	33.4	27.6	26.3											
50 years and over	19.2	75.2	37.6	16.9	19.1	16.2	6.9	4.4	5.7											
Unpainted frame	35.7	7.6	11.1	8.7	54.6	56.7	55.7	24.3	21.5											
Having bathrooms	14.5	33.0	16.8	16.6	7.8	4.8	11.3	20.2	57.1											
Having water supplied to house																				
Hand pump in dwelling	14.0	28.9	34.9	23.7	10.1	2.7	1.9	5.9	5.6											
Piped cold only	8.7	28.9	9.3	7.8	4.9	1.9	1.7	13.6	24.2											
Piped hot and cold	7.7	26.3	8.8	8.0	4.0	2.2	1.7	13.2	45.7											
Having indoor toilet																				
Chemical	0.5	2.5	1.2	1.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2											
Flush	8.5	29.4	10.3	8.8	4.9	2.5	3.6	11.9	41.5											
Having kitchen sink with drain	28.4	96.1	55.1	37.5	12.4	5.4	10.9	31.1	75.0											
Having electricity																				
Home plant	3.9	2.5	6.2	8.0	2.4	1.4	2.5	3.6	2.0											
Power line	13.2	55.0	20.5	10.1	8.0	3.6	4.1	24.3	71.0											
Having central heating system	8.6	23.9	23.4	17.0	1.5	1.0	0.3	4.8	5.7											
Having specified cooking stoves																				
Kerosene or gasoline	24.4	24.0	43.3	45.5	9.2	6.7	23.0	19.2	15.4											
Gas or electric	4.2	5.5	7.1	2.9	2.2	0.7	2.3	6.9	24.6											
Having specified refrigeration																				
Ice	22.7	54.3	18.8	22.5	22.1	18.7	26.4	22.5	24.9											
Mechanical	2.4	10.6	2.3	2.5	1.8	1.1	1.6	3.9	8.5											
Not reporting screens	26.8	4.3	8.2	7.0	50.6	44.1	32.2	12.4	13.9											
Not reporting exterior paint	40.0	8.9	14.8	12.2	59.9	62.2	58.4	34.7	22.9											
Reporting poor condition of																				
Foundations	26.9	6.9	15.4	20.6	34.5	30.4	36.7	28.1	21.0											
Exterior walls	19.3	6.2	11.7	12.5	25.4	22.7	27.3	19.2	11.2											
Roofs	26.6	8.4	16.3	18.7	33.7	31.8	36.1	27.6	18.8											
Floors	19.9	6.6	11.8	15.2	26.5	21.7	26.2	23.4	14.0											
Chimneys	16.1	3.9	6.6	8.3	17.6	18.7	32.2	15.6	8.7											
Doors and windows	23.8	4.3	12.5	15.3	37.1	30.7	33.4	28.0	9.7											
Interior walls and ceilings	28.1	10.1	16.0	19.1	37.4	34.2	37.0	28.0	20.0											

a/ Includes 2,033 houses in New Jersey, which were not included in this table.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Home Economics, The Farm-Housing Survey, Miscellaneous Publication No. 333, Washington, 1939, passim.

houses of all in that part of the country in which rural housing generally is poor.

On every item included in the Farm-Housing Survey, the South stood out as the worst section of the country (Table 66). The majority of southern farmhouses in 1934 were unpainted frame structures in contrast to the painted frame houses which predominated in all other parts of the country.⁶ Only a small proportion of southern farmhouses had an inside water supply, whereas a substantial proportion of the houses in other sections at least had piped water or hand pumps if not bathrooms. Indoor flush toilets were rare in the South but relatively common in New England and in the Pacific states. One would expect refrigeration facilities to be most frequent in the South, where the need is certainly greater than in the rest of the country, but actually such facilities were much more frequent in New England and somewhat more frequent on the Pacific coast. In regard to screens, for which the need is also greater in the South than in other areas, the section appeared still more disadvantaged. The subjective judgments on conditions of foundations, roofs, walls, chimneys, and so forth tell practically the same story. On every count rural-farm housing conditions were worse in the South than elsewhere. Against this background racial differences in housing in eleven southern states can be examined.

Characteristically, southern farm families live in unpainted frame houses, and throughout the South the weather-beaten, dull gray frame house meets the eye. Half of the white families and four out of five Negro families in the eleven states for which data were tabulated by color lived in such houses (Table 67).

In many cases the age of a house has a marked influence on its quality, although it does not necessarily follow that any group of comparatively old houses is characterized by a lower quality than a group of new or middle-aged structures. Southern white farm families lived in comparatively new houses somewhat more often than nonwhite families (Appendix table 38). Nearly one-fifth of the white farm families in eleven southern states as compared with one-seventh of the colored families resided in structures which were less than ten years old. On the other hand, the proportion of families living in houses at least fifty years old was smaller among Negroes (12 per cent) than among whites (18 per cent). In view of the fact that housing quality is generally much poorer for Negroes than for whites, it seems probable that this difference was due to the generally poorer construction of Negro houses. The largest propor-

⁶ *The Farm-Housing Survey, op. cit.*, pp. 2-6.

Table 67. - Farmhouses in 11 Southern States, by Material of House and Color of Operator, 1934

Color of Operator and State	Total Number	Farm Operators Per cent of dwellings which were			
		Brick, stone, etc.	Log or earth	Painted frame	Unpainted frame
Nonwhite					
11 states, total	73,066	0.3	5.5	13.5	80.7
Owners	16,296	0.5	7.7	22.8	69.0
Nonowners	57,770	0.1	5.0	11.1	83.8
Maryland	935	2.6	1.0	84.6	11.8
Virginia	6,744	1.0	25.1	33.3	40.6
North Carolina	8,547	0.2	3.4	21.5	74.9
South Carolina	6,869	0.2	2.1	8.1	89.6
Georgia	12,346	*	2.3	8.7	88.9
Florida	2,414	0.4	0.8	17.3	81.5
Tennessee	3,972	0.6	12.7	15.3	71.4
Alabama	7,426	0.1	6.3	6.6	87.0
Mississippi	10,704	*	3.8	7.6	88.5
Arkansas	7,040	0.1	1.8	8.9	89.2
Louisiana	6,069	0.1	1.4	6.8	91.7
White					
11 states, total	155,537	2.3	5.0	40.7	52.0
Owners	81,422	3.1	4.2	50.9	41.8
Nonowners	74,115	1.5	5.9	29.4	63.2
Maryland	6,612	15.6	1.0	77.8	5.6
Virginia	16,230	6.2	10.1	58.6	25.1
North Carolina	19,652	1.5	3.7	42.3	52.5
South Carolina	8,636	0.5	2.4	25.9	71.2
Georgia	20,793	0.4	3.7	31.4	64.5
Florida	10,644	5.6	1.4	54.8	38.2
Tennessee	24,113	1.5	8.7	45.0	44.8
Alabama	14,012	0.4	5.6	30.3	63.8
Mississippi	11,085	0.6	3.4	26.3	69.7
Arkansas	13,427	0.9	5.7	35.9	57.5
Louisiana	10,333	*	1.9	27.3	70.8

* Less than 0.05 per cent.

Source; Unpublished data, Farm-Housing Survey, 1934.

tion of houses built within the last ten years for both white and non-white operators was found in Florida, where truck farming and orchards have been expanding.

The general condition of a house is largely dependent upon the soundness of its foundation. Yet, the foundations of about 30 per cent of the white farm families' houses in eleven southern states were considered to be in poor condition (Table 68). About one-half of the Negro farm families lived in houses with poor foundations. There was no great difference between Negro owners and non-

Table 68. - Proportion of Farmhouses in 11 Southern States in Which Specified Structural Items Were Characterized by Survey Enumerators as in Poor Condition, by Color of Operator, 1934

State	Per cent of farmhouses with specified item characterized as in poor condition											
	Foundations		Floors		Roofs		Exterior walls		Interior walls and ceilings		Chimneys	
	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White
11 states, total...	48.9	30.0	35.7	22.1	46.8	29.6	36.9	21.5	53.5	32.3	31.1	17.7
Owners	46.4	22.6	34.0	16.5	48.4	25.6	34.8	15.1	48.2	23.7	29.5	13.0
Nonowners	49.5	36.2	36.2	28.2	46.4	34.0	37.4	28.5	54.9	41.7	31.5	22.8
Maryland	24.6	5.2	19.6	4.9	29.5	9.9	28.0	6.5	38.1	9.8	13.0	3.6
Virginia	41.4	21.8	25.9	13.3	36.4	17.1	29.9	15.2	38.8	22.4	21.4	9.0
North Carolina	53.3	29.7	46.6	24.9	48.3	27.9	45.3	21.6	57.2	30.6	30.6	15.5
South Carolina	48.8	28.6	42.2	25.0	56.1	39.8	42.6	21.6	54.9	33.4	33.9	20.0
Georgia	52.6	32.8	33.4	22.7	48.7	33.6	32.9	21.0	58.7	37.0	24.6	14.1
Florida	78.9	42.4	72.4	39.1	68.6	35.0	66.9	28.2	83.2	51.8	58.2	24.0
Tennessee	34.4	22.7	24.1	16.7	41.7	25.6	31.0	18.3	40.2	24.6	23.7	13.3
Alabama	40.5	34.9	24.1	21.9	39.4	30.3	27.0	25.0	56.5	36.4	26.3	19.6
Mississippi	45.7	33.9	33.5	27.7	42.6	36.7	32.4	24.7	51.9	39.5	31.7	25.0
Arkansas	59.9	43.2	43.6	26.2	58.2	36.0	45.7	27.0	59.0	38.5	46.3	30.6
Louisiana	47.9	31.4	33.1	22.3	42.7	35.1	37.4	27.1	45.1	31.1	40.0	28.3

Source: Unpublished data, Farm-Housing Survey, 1934.

owners in this respect but a substantial one between the corresponding tenure groups in the white population.

The same general differences found with regard to foundations were also found with regard to floors, roofs, exterior walls, interior walls and ceilings, chimneys, and doors and windows; namely, that Negroes were much worse off than whites, that white owners less frequently lived in houses with such deficiencies than nonowners, but that the differences between Negro owners and nonowners were not striking (Table 68 and Appendix table 39).

Facilities and Conveniences

Southern farms are lacking not only in sound structural features but also in ordinary conveniences and facilities. Thus more than one-third of the white farm families and over three-fourths of the Negro families in the eleven southern states were residing in unscreened homes.⁷ In addition, most of the screens in Negro homes which did have such equipment were considered to be in poor condition (Appendix table 40). This was also true of a substantial proportion of the screens in white homes. Consequently, less than half of the white homes and less than one-tenth of the Negro homes actually had screens which were considered in good or fair condition. As usual, nonowners in the white population were worse off than owners. There was also a considerable difference between the two tenure groups in the Negro population, both of which had a much smaller proportion of screened houses than white tenants. Only about 2 per cent of the Negro tenants had screens considered in good condition.

The situation at the time of the Farm-Housing Survey with regard to sanitary facilities was particularly serious (Appendix table 41). Everywhere the outdoor privy was the usual form of toilet facility. Data from the Consumer Purchases Study for farmers in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi revealed, moreover, that 10 per cent of all Negro farm families (8 per cent of the operator families and 12 per cent of the sharecropper families) and over 2 per cent of all white farm families (2 per cent of the operator families and 4 per cent of the sharecropper families) were without facilities of any kind.⁸ Since these surveys were made, sanitary conditions in the South have been greatly improved through the program of the Work Projects Administration for the construction of

⁷ These figures include cases for which the question on screens was unanswered but which probably did not affect the results materially.

⁸ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 399, Table 29.

Table 69. Farmhouses in 11 Southern States with Specified Water Supply, by Color of Operator, 1934

State	Per cent of dwellings occupied by nonwhite farm operators with specified water supply			Per cent of dwellings occupied by white farm operators with specified water supply		
	Hand pump in house	Piped water		Hand pump in house	Piped water	
		Cold only	Hot and cold		Cold only	Hot and cold
11 states, total	2.6	0.6	0.1	7.6	5.6	4.1
Owners	3.4	0.6	0.2	9.3	7.4	6.3
Nonowners	2.3	0.6	0.1	5.6	3.7	1.6
Maryland	4.2	2.9	0.7	10.9	12.3	17.2
Virginia	0.6	0.8	0.4	5.9	8.2	8.9
North Carolina	12.3	0.3	*	19.9	4.3	3.4
South Carolina	5.3	0.4	0.1	13.7	3.1	2.7
Georgia	1.1	0.2	0.1	3.3	4.0	1.5
Florida	4.8	3.6	0.2	20.1	20.7	11.6
Tennessee	0.7	0.5	0.1	4.6	2.5	2.2
Alabama	0.1	0.2	*	1.7	2.0	1.2
Mississippi	0.4	0.3	0.1	2.2	3.5	2.6
Arkansas	0.6	0.5	0.1	2.0	3.0	1.6
Louisiana	0.2	0.6	*	3.1	7.1	1.1

* Less than 0.05 per cent.

Source: Unpublished data, Farm-Housing Survey, 1934.

sanitary privies, but even so it has not met the full need.⁹ It should be remembered in this connection that the lower income groups were underrepresented in the farm sample of the Consumer Purchases Study and hence were even more subject to the health hazards of inadequate sanitary provisions than the data indicate.

As would be expected from the general lack of indoor toilet facilities, most farmhouses in the South did not have running water in 1934. Only about 3 per cent of the Negro farmhouses and 17 per cent of the white farmhouses in the eleven southern states surveyed had water piped or pumped into the house. In some states less than 1 per cent of the houses occupied by Negroes had an indoor water supply (Table 69).¹⁰ As a result few farm women had the convenience of a kitchen sink with drain (Appendix table 42).¹¹ Bathrooms were infrequent and even when reported they were not always equipped with both tub and lavatory. Less than 1 per cent of Negro farmhouses had bathing facilities other than the primitive metal or wooden tub.

Neither were lighting facilities adequate according to modern standards. Few southern farmhouses were lighted by gas or electricity in 1934. Including home plants for electricity, only 13 per cent of the white farm operators and 1 per cent of the nonwhite operators in eleven southern states reported gas or electricity (Appendix table 43). The remainder had to rely on kerosene lamps or had no lighting facilities at all.

As a result of the limited availability of gas and electricity, gas or electric cooking stoves were rare in southern farmhouses; but kerosene or gasoline stoves were reported by 12 per cent of the white families (Appendix table 44). Only 1 per cent of all Negro farm families had stoves of these types.¹²

The lack of electricity in southern farm homes has been partially met since the surveys of housing facilities were made by the tremendous expansion of central-station service under the Rural Electrification Administration (Appendix table 45). According to estimates as of December 31, 1934, only 1 to 17 per cent of the farms in the various southern states had this service. By June 30, 1940,

⁹ Through December 31, 1939, the WPA had constructed 1,761,000 sanitary privies of which nearly 800,000 were in six southern states. Federal Works Agency, Work Project Administration, *Report of Progress of the WPA Program, June 30, 1940*, Washington, pp. 75-76.

¹⁰ Data from the Consumer Purchases Study substantiate these findings. See U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 399, Table 29.

¹¹ *Idem.*

¹² *Ibid.*, Table 31. Data from the Consumer Purchases Study confirm the fact that coal and wood stoves are generally found in the rural South.

Table 70. - Farmhouses in 11 Southern States with Refrigeration and Power Washing Machines, by Color of Operator, 1934

State	Per cent of dwellings occupied by nonwhite farm operators with			Per cent of dwellings occupied by white farm operators with		
	Refrigeration		Power washing machine	Refrigeration		Power washing machine
	Ice	Mechanical		Ice	Mechanical	
11 states, total ...	9.6	0.1	0.1	24.8	2.1	3.6
Owners	18.6	0.1	0.2	31.7	3.4	5.3
Nonowners	7.2	0.1	*	17.3	0.7	1.8
Maryland	38.0	-	1.7	41.6	4.5	26.9
Virginia	20.1	0.1	0.2	32.8	4.3	10.2
North Carolina	9.8	0.1	0.2	24.3	1.5	2.5
South Carolina	6.2	*	-	21.2	1.1	0.2
Georgia	9.9	0.2	*	24.0	0.9	0.1
Florida	22.5	*	0.1	50.0	8.8	6.2
Tennessee	10.8	0.1	0.1	21.4	1.0	1.6
Alabama	4.5	-	*	12.8	0.6	0.2
Mississippi	6.9	0.1	-	28.2	1.0	0.2
Arkansas	7.7	*	*	15.0	1.8	3.5
Louisiana	3.7	*	-	15.0	1.3	0.3

* Less than 0.05 per cent.

Source; Unpublished data, Farm-Housing Survey, 1934.

however, 6 to 41 per cent of the farms had central-station service. In spite of increases between the two dates which amounted to as much as 700 per cent and more in Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina, however, the great majority of all southern farm homes are still without electricity.

The need for central heating is, of course, not as great in the South as elsewhere in the country, and its absence ordinarily cannot be construed as a housing deficiency. Except for Maryland, central heating was almost never found in southern farmhouses.¹³ The fireplace is the typical means of heating a southern dwelling unit, and only one out of five white farm families and one out of eight or nine Negro farm families reported stoves other than the kitchen stove in 1935-36.¹⁴

Just as the climate makes central heating a luxury which can be dispensed with in the South, so it makes refrigeration particularly needed. The lack of electricity in 1934 is again reflected in the small proportion of southern farmhouses with mechanical refrigeration. Even the group using ice was relatively small (Table 70). In fact, some of the states in the deep South were worse off in this respect than the border states. In Louisiana, for example, only 16 per cent of the white families and 4 per cent of the nonwhite families had either ice or mechanical refrigeration.

Power washing machines were also infrequent conveniences in white southern farm homes and were almost nonexistent in Negro homes. Like mechanical refrigeration, their increase is dependent upon the increased availability of electric power and upon sufficient income so that families can afford the equipment.

Crowded Living Conditions

The deficiencies in southern rural housing relate not only to matters of quality but also to quantitative aspects. Moreover, these latter are of particular importance in the South as compared with other parts of the country (Table 71). Farm households were larger on the average in the southern divisions than in other parts of the country, while the average number of rooms per house was smaller than in any division except the Mountain states. Quantitative housing conditions seemed to be best in the Northeast. A New England farmhouse contained on the average 8.9 rooms, of which 4.2 were bedrooms. As the average size of household was 4.4 persons, there was

¹³ According to the Farm-Housing Survey, less than 1 per cent of all nonwhite farm dwellings and little more than 1 per cent of all white farm dwellings in the eleven southern states had central heating systems.

¹⁴ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 399, Table 31.

Table 71. - Average Number of Rooms per Farmhouse and Average Number of Occupants per House and per Room, by Geographic Divisions, 1934

Geographic division	Average number of rooms per house		Average number of occupants	
	All rooms	Bedrooms	Per house	Per room
United States	5.4	2.8	4.6	0.86
New England	8.9	4.2	4.4	0.50
Middle Atlantic (a)	8.6	4.6	4.4	0.51
East North Central	6.9	3.5	4.3	0.62
West North Central	6.0	3.0	4.5	0.75
South Atlantic	5.2	2.8	5.2	1.00
East South Central	4.4	2.4	4.8	1.11
West South Central	4.2	2.2	4.6	1.10
Mountain	4.5	2.1	4.5	1.00
Pacific	5.4	2.7	3.9	0.72

(a) Represented by only 2 New Jersey counties.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Home Economics, The Farm-Housing Survey, Miscellaneous Publication No. 323, Washington, 1939, pp. 7-10.

1 person for every 2 rooms and only slightly more than 1 person per bedroom. In the southern and Mountain divisions, on the other hand, the average number of rooms per house was between 4 and 5 and the average number of bedrooms was between 2 and 3, which resulted in 1-1.11 occupants per room and approximately 2 persons per bedroom.

Not more than 1 person per room is a standard which has been deemed reasonable by many investigators of American housing, although some accept a limit of 1.5 persons. On the average, according to these standards, rural farm homes in the South were not particularly crowded. More detailed data, however, indicate that wide variations from the average existed. Among white farm owners in eleven southern states, the average number of persons per room in 1934 was only 0.83 (Table 72). The averages by states, however, were usually so near 1 that it is reasonably certain that some of the families lived under crowded conditions. The averages for all white tenants and for colored owners (1.14 and 1.15 persons per room, respectively) also indicate that some overcrowding must have existed. The nonwhite tenants, however, showed by far the worst overcrowding. Their average for the eleven states was 1.45 persons per room. Alabama with an average of 1.67 persons per room had the worst conditions among all the states.

These conditions were partly due to differences in the number of rooms per house. For white owners in the South the average number of rooms per house was 5.6, for white tenants or colored owners 4.5, and for colored tenants only 3.6. There were, however, striking differences in these averages by states.

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Table 72. - Average Number of Rooms and Average Number of Occupants per Room in Farmhouses in 11 Southern States, by Color and Tenure of Operator, 1934

State	Average number of rooms per house			Average number of occupants per room				
	Nonwhite		Total	White		Total	Nonwhite Owners	White Owners
	Owners	Nonowners		Owners	Nonowners			
11 states, total	3.8	3.6	5.1	5.6	4.5	1.38	1.15	0.96
Maryland	5.3	5.3	8.7	8.8	8.5	0.88	0.74	0.50
Virginia	4.5	4.9	6.1	6.5	5.4	1.23	1.06	0.83
North Carolina	4.2	4.1	5.4	5.8	4.9	1.44	1.20	0.94
South Carolina	4.3	4.7	5.2	5.8	4.7	1.34	1.23	0.94
Georgia	3.7	4.3	4.8	5.3	4.4	1.44	1.25	1.00
Florida	4.0	4.4	5.1	5.3	4.7	1.17	1.07	0.85
Tennessee	3.4	3.8	4.5	5.0	3.9	1.39	1.14	0.85
Alabama	3.3	4.1	4.4	5.1	4.0	1.59	1.28	1.05
Mississippi	3.4	4.2	4.7	5.3	4.1	1.43	1.24	1.02
Arkansas	3.4	3.3	4.2	4.6	3.9	1.32	1.19	1.00
Louisiana	3.5	3.4	4.5	5.0	3.9	1.34	1.16	0.97
							1.37	1.11
								0.83
								0.47
								0.74
								0.85
								0.88
								0.90
								0.78
								0.89
								1.13
								0.95
								1.02
								1.10
								0.97
								1.03
								1.29
								0.56
								1.00
								1.08
								1.15
								1.01
								1.27
								1.29
								1.19
								1.25
								1.03
								1.29

Source: Unpublished data, Farm-Housing Survey, 1934.

Further information on crowding is provided in the expenditure sample of the Consumer Purchases Study; but since the poorest farm families were underrepresented, since all families of 9 or more persons or containing 5 to 8 adults without any children were excluded, and since lodgers and resident servants were not included in the classification by family type, the data furnish a picture which is actually too favorable. In spite of the limitations, however, they confirm the assumption that a considerable proportion of rural-farm families suffer from cramped living conditions. Families belonging to type I (man and wife without any children) can, of course, practically never be crowded if they live in a house, but even when there are only 1 or 2 children in the family (types II and III) a certain amount of crowding may occur. According to the housing standard whereby more than 1.5 persons per room constitutes overcrowding, a few white farm families in the South of these types lived under crowded conditions in comparison with around 10 per cent of Negro farm families (Table 73). Family types IV and V include households with at least 3 adults and 0 to 3 children. Overcrowding among Negro farm families was somewhat more serious for these types than for family types II and III. Moreover, more than 1 out of 10 white sharecropper families of this size lived under crowded conditions. Among family types VI and VII, consisting of husband, wife, and 3 or 4 children or families of 7 or 8 persons of whom at least 1 was a child under sixteen years of age, crowding was severe for Negroes and whites alike. More than three-fifths of all Negro farm families and between one-fourth and one-half of all white farm families reported more than 1.5 persons per room. These were the only family types in which the excessive crowding measured by more than 2 persons per room was extensive. It rose as high as 17 per cent among Negro farm operators and 15 per cent among Negro sharecroppers in the North Carolina-South Carolina sample and 13 per cent among white sharecroppers in Georgia and Mississippi.

There can be no doubt that the extent of overcrowding increases markedly with family size. The significance of these findings is not minimized by pointing out that only a certain proportion of the families comprise the units which are so large that they are threatened by overcrowding. In the first place, it has been shown in the chapter on family composition that the proportion of such families is large in the rural-farm population of the South. In the second place, family size changes. Many of the households which are quite small at any given period are either to become larger or have been larger. The proportion of the population which at some time during

Table 73. - Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Southern Farm Counties with More than 1.5 Persons and More than 2 Persons per Room, by Family Type, ^a/ Tenure, and Color, 1935-36

Family type	Number of families in sample				Per cent of families with more than 1.5 persons per room				Per cent of families with more than 2.0 persons per room			
	Farm operators		Sharecroppers		Farm operators		Sharecroppers		Farm operators		Sharecroppers	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
North Carolina-South Carolina counties												
Family type I	49	250	66	96	2.0	1.2	0.0	2.1	2.0	0.8	0.0	0.0
II-III	63	372	146	192	12.7	3.0	6.2	4.7	1.6	0.8	1.4	0.0
IV-V	164	731	217	146	10.3	4.7	14.7	11.7	1.2	0.7	3.2	1.4
VI-VII	155	589	206	193	59.4	27.1	63.6	46.4	17.4	4.3	15.0	7.3
Georgia-Mississippi counties												
Family type I	116	262	123	77	0.0	0.4	0.8	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
II-III	124	304	184	171	9.7	1.3	11.4	5.3	1.6	0.0	0.5	0.0
IV-V	206	527	220	163	11.2	2.9	17.3	10.4	1.0	0.2	0.9	1.8
VI-VII	63	165	96	70	68.3	35.0	60.4	45.7	3.2	3.1	13.5	12.9

^a/ For a description of family types, see p. 80.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 399, Table 36.

life belonged to families which have suffered from overcrowding because of their size is, therefore, always greater than the corresponding proportion which at any given time faces such conditions. The chances are that the suffering involved frequently occurs when the persons concerned are young and, consequently, more easily subject to the injuries, both physical and psychological, associated with overcrowding. The data indicate not only that Negroes are more seriously affected by overcrowding than whites but also that crowding in the South is more prevalent among large families, both Negro and white, than is usually recognized.

RURAL-NONFARM HOUSING

There is little factual information on housing in rural-nonfarm areas. While the plight of agriculture has been widely heralded in recent years and thus some attention has been drawn to the farmer's home conditions, little attention has been paid to the rural-nonfarm or village population of the country. The most important source of information available is the Consumer Purchases Study data for native-born, nonrelief, normal families in thirty-four villages in four southeastern states. These relate to household facilities and extent of overcrowding but do not throw light on the condition of the houses themselves.

Three-fourths of the Negro families in southeastern villages had no indoor water supply at all in 1935-36 as compared with 15 per cent of the white families (Table 74). More than half of the white families had hot and cold running water in their kitchens and for their bathtubs or showers as contrasted with 3 or 4 per cent of the

Table 74. - Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Southeastern Villages with Specified Indoor Water Supply, by Color, 1935-36

Item	Negro	White
Total number of families	972	2,100
Per cent with indoor water supply in kitchen		
Total	100.0	100.0
Running water		
Hot and cold	3.9	51.8
Cold only	16.8	30.9
Hand pump	3.2	2.1
None	76.1	15.2
Per cent with bath tub or shower		
Running water		
Hot and cold	3.2	52.0
Cold only	6.4	23.4

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 399, Table 29.

Negroes. About 17 per cent of the Negroes had cold running water in their kitchens but only 6 per cent had it available for baths. Nine-tenths of the Negro families in villages had no bathtubs or showers at all. Indicative of the better living conditions among white families in villages than on farms is the fact that 77 per cent of the white village families had kitchen sinks with drains. In contrast, only 13 per cent of Negro village families had this convenience.¹⁵

Although not representative of the sources of water supply for southern villages without public water systems, the sources of drinking water in the Negro village of Bertrandville, Louisiana, give a clue to conditions which are known to be relatively widespread (Table 75). The health hazards latent in such sources of drinking water as wooden barrels and iron drums are obvious.

The situation with regard to indoor flush toilets was much better in the villages than on farms, although it was still particularly unsatisfactory for Negroes (Table 76). There were actually twenty-

Table 75.— Source of Drinking Water in the Negro Village of Bertrandville, La.

Source of drinking water	Number of families	Per cent
Total	85	100.0
Cistern	31	36.5
Wooden barrel	15	17.6
Iron drum	20	23.5
Open kettle	4	4.7
Shallow well	2	2.4
Hauled water	13	15.3

Source: Vernon J. Parenton, "A Sociological Study of a Negro Village in the French Section of Louisiana," unpublished M. A. thesis, Louisiana State University, 1938.

two Negro village families, or 2 per cent of the total, which had no toilet facilities at all, while 87 per cent of all Negro families had outdoor privies. In contrast, three-fourths of the white families in southeastern villages had indoor flush toilets.

Village families were also much better off than farm families with regard to lighting. More than 90 per cent of the white village families had electric lights and only 9 per cent still used kerosene lamps (Table 76). Negro village families were also better off in this respect than farm families; but only about one-fifth of all Negro village families had electric lights, while the remainder still used kerosene lamps.

¹⁵ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 399, Table 29.

Table 76.- Toilet, Lighting, Cooking, and Heating Facilities of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Southeastern Villages, by Color, 1935-36

Item	Negro	White
Per cent of families with specified toilet facilities		
Indoor flush toilet	9.9	75.4
Indoor other	0.5	1.3
Outdoor privy	87.3	23.3
None	2.3	-
Per cent of families with living quarters lighted principally by		
Electricity	21.3	90.6
Kerosene	78.6	9.4
Gas or other	0.1	*
Per cent of families using as principal cooking fuel		
Wood, coal, cobs	91.3	38.0
Kerosene	5.7	29.4
Combination of wood, coal, or cobs, and kerosene	2.5	9.9
Other combinations	0.4	5.2
Gas	0.1	6.4
Electricity	-	11.1
Per cent of families with living quarters heated principally by		
Central furnace	-	3.7
Stove other than kitchen	36.4	55.3
Fireplace	62.3	40.7
Kitchen stove	1.3	0.3

* Less than 0.05 per cent.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 399, Tables 29 and 30.

There was no cooking by electricity at all among Negro village families, however, and only 11 per cent of the white families had electric stoves (Table 76). Among both Negro and white families, wood, coal, and cobs were the most important fuel for cooking, but almost 30 per cent of the white families used kerosene only and another 10 per cent used it in combination with other types of fuel.

Like farm families, village families rarely had central heating. Sixty-two per cent of the Negro families in villages were still dependent on fireplaces for heat, while the largest proportion of whites (55 per cent) used stoves other than those in the kitchens (Table 76).

With regard to the amount of overcrowding, the same trends found among farm families are again apparent; namely, an increase in crowding with increases in family size (Table 77). The explanation is, of course, that the size of the dwelling does not increase at the same rate as the size of the family. The result is that the large Negro families in villages appeared to be overcrowded to an even greater extent than corresponding households in farm areas.

Table 77. - Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Southeastern Villages with More than 1.5 and More than 2 Persons per Room, by Family Type, a/ 1935-36

Family type	Number of families in sample		Per cent of families with more than 1.5 persons per room		Per cent of families with more than 2.0 persons per room	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Family type I	332	464	2.7	0.4	0.6	0.0
II-III	257	731	17.9	4.8	3.5	1.0
IV-V	267	693	21.4	3.4	6.4	0.4
VI-VII	115	210	66.1	27.6	30.4	9.5

a/ For a description of family types, see p. 80.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 399, Table 36.

Chapter X

HOUSING CONDITIONS

Urban Housing

The most exhaustive material available on urban housing is in the Real Property Inventories first conducted by the Civil Works Administration, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, and the Work Projects Administration in succession in co-operation with the U. S. Department of Commerce and now sponsored by the Federal Housing Administration. While the published data¹ are not available by race except in some locally prepared reports, such data have been obtained for a number of cities with heavy Negro population from work sheets deposited with the Federal Housing Administration. The number of cities covered by Real Property Inventories is steadily increasing. The recent studies, many of which are in the South, generally contain more information by race than the older ones.

Connected with the Real Property Inventories, which had 100 per cent coverage, are two sample studies. The Financial Survey of Urban Housing covered a 13 per cent sample of the dwellings in sixty-one cities.² In some cases this study contains information by race on rents, mortgages, incomes, and similar items. Racial data on other housing conditions are available in the study of Consumer Use of Selected Goods and Services for cities in which nonwhites represent a significant proportion of the population. This study is based on a comparison of the schedules from the Financial Survey of Urban Housing and from the Real Property Inventories. Some additional information is available in the National Health Survey, the Consumer Purchases Study, and several smaller studies.

¹ Peyton Stapp, *Urban Housing*, A Summary of Real Property Inventories Conducted as Work Projects, 1934-1936, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938. There are also a number of local publications.

² David L. Wickens, *Financial Survey of Urban Housing*, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Washington, 1937.

General data from the Real Property Inventories on urban housing conditions, irrespective of race, indicate that conditions are worse in the Southeast than in other sections of the country (Appendix table 46). For example, the most common size of dwelling in the Southeast in 1934-36 was 3 rooms in comparison with 5 rooms or more in other regions. Yet households were largest in the Southeast.³ Under such circumstances overcrowding must be more prevalent in the Southeast than in most other parts of the country. Of all dwelling units in the sample of southeastern cities, 26 per cent had more than 1 person per room and 3.5 per cent had more than 2 persons per room. The corresponding figures for the Southwest were at almost the same level (25 per cent and 3.5 per cent, respectively), but the figures for all cities surveyed were much lower (17 per cent and 1.2 per cent, respectively). Housing facilities are also poorer in the Southeast than in other areas. Nearly one-third of the dwelling units in the southeastern cities were without private flush toilets, more than two-fifths lacked private baths, and one-half were without gas or electricity for cooking. The proportion of dwelling units without running water was, however, slightly higher in the Southwest (15 per cent) than in the Southeast (13 per cent). In view of the fact that the number of rooms per dwelling unit was smaller and the quality of housing was lower in the Southeast than in other regions, it is not surprising to find also that the level of rentals was considerably lower. The monthly rent was less than \$10 for 38 per cent of the tenant-occupied dwelling units in the sample of southeastern cities and was as high as \$30 or more for only 14 per cent of the units.

QUALITY OF HOUSING

The quality of urban housing available to Negroes is, of course, much inferior on the average to that available to whites. This shows up in the case of every equipment item on which statistical information exists as well as in regard to the general condition of the houses. This fact is so well known that there is no need to present more than a sample of the available evidence.

Among native-born, nonrelief, normal families in the four small southern cities⁴ included in the Consumer Purchases Study, almost

³ Several of the larger cities in the North were not covered in this survey. The incomplete data indicate that the proportion of dwellings with a small number of rooms was even larger in New York City than in the southeastern cities.

⁴ Albany, Ga.; Gastonia, N. C.; Sumter, S. C.; and Griffin, Ga. See U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 399, Table 29.

60 per cent of the white dwelling units had hot and cold water in kitchen and bathroom. Only about 10 per cent of the white families had no indoor water supply at all for either kitchen or bathroom; but more than 60 per cent of the Negro families had no indoor water supply for the kitchen, and more than 75 per cent had none for a bathroom. In comparison with 88 per cent of the white families, only 26 per cent of the Negro families reported having a kitchen sink with drain.

Among the sixteen southern cities covered by the Study of Consumer Use of Selected Goods and Services, dwelling units without bathtub or shower were found among whites in each city; but the homes of Negro owners were less well equipped than were those of white tenants. There was no city in the group except Cleveland and Dallas in which as many as half of the Negro tenants had tub or shower. In Birmingham, Alabama, Paducah, Kentucky, Charleston, South Carolina, and Jackson, Mississippi, more than 90 per cent of the Negro tenants had no facilities of this kind.⁵

A comparable situation existed with regard to toilet facilities. In the southern cities covered in the National Health Survey, 73 per cent of the white families and 9 per cent of the colored families in cities of less than 10,000 population had indoor flush toilets (Appendix table 47). These proportions were lower than those for the four small southern cities covered in the Consumer Purchases Study. In those cities 90 per cent of the white families and 29 per cent of the Negro families had indoor flush toilets, while 9 per cent of the whites and 70 per cent of the Negroes had outdoor privies.⁶ It must be remembered, moreover, that the latter study is based on a sample of native-born, nonrelief, normal families, which is a relatively favored group.

An important trend noticeable in the Health Survey data was the definite increase in private flush toilets as the size of the city increased. This trend is to be expected, for, as the size of the city increases, protective sanitary measures increase.

On the basis of relief status and income, striking race differentials appeared. The nonrelief colored families in all groups of southern cities studied lived in homes which were less frequently equipped with adequate toilet facilities than were the homes of white families on relief. In southern cities with less than 10,000 population 40 per cent

⁵ U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, *Consumer Use of Selected Goods and Services, by Income Classes*, Market Research Series, Nos. 5-12, Washington, 1935-1937, Tables 5 and 7.

⁶ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 399, Table 29.

Table 78.- Proportion of Families in Selected Cities Using Gas or Electricity for Cooking, by Color and Tenure, 1933

City	Per cent of families using gas or electricity for cooking				City	Per cent of families using gas or electricity for cooking			
	Negro owners	Negro tenants	White owners	White tenants		Negro owners	Negro tenants	White owners	White tenants
Trenton, N. J.	t	36.8	98.0	91.8	Jacksonville, Fla.	0.7	0.3	72.9	54.0
Cleveland, Ohio	77.8	75.2	97.2	97.4	Paducah, Ky.	7.3	1.5	54.3	38.9
Topeka, Kan.	64.2	47.2	92.0	85.1	Birmingham, Ala.	3.9	1.0	90.4	78.5
Richmond, Va.	33.9	10.8	95.3	84.6	Jackson, Miss	t	2.2	99.4	96.4
Wheeling, W. Va.	t	71.8	96.9	94.1	Little Rock, Ark.	44.7	18.3	97.8	89.5
Asheville, N. C.	t	-	45.6	21.1	Baton Rouge, La.	29.5	19.4	94.9	87.0
Greensboro, N. C.	t	0.4	73.9	35.6	Oklahoma City, Okla.	69.7	48.6	97.8	97.1
Columbia, S. C.	13.0	0.5	87.9	53.8	Austin, Texas	21.2	4.4	88.6	82.3
Charleston, S. C.	23.7	0.8	89.8	70.9	Dallas, Texas	66.2	49.2	98.5	96.1
Atlanta, Ga.	24.8	5.1	94.5	80.2					

t Fewer than 100 cases.

Sources: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Consumer Use of Selected Goods and Services, by Income Classes, Market Research Series, Nos. 5-12, Washington, 1935-37, Table 5.

of the white families on relief had access to private indoor toilets and only 4 per cent used communal toilets, while the comparable figures for colored nonrelief families were 10 per cent in both cases. In southern cities of 25,000-100,000, 20 per cent of the colored nonrelief families but only 8 per cent of the white relief families had the unhygienic substitute for adequate toilet facilities that the communal privy represents. This suggests that racial housing segregation makes the housing facilities for colored families poorer, at least in certain respects, even than for those white families which, on the average, have a somewhat lower economic status.

Even though heating facilities are largely determined by climatic conditions, there were consistent differences in heating equipment between Negro and white homes. In most of the cities included in the study of Consumer Use of Selected Goods and Services, Negro owners had poorer heating facilities than white tenants (Appendix table 48). In the more northern cities, in which a central-heating system would be most desirable, the great majority of the Negro households were dependent upon stoves for heat. In the southern cities, where the white households usually had at least a heating stove and, in many cases, a central-heating system, the Negro families were likely to have only a fireplace for heating purposes. In five of the sixteen southern cities included in the analysis, more than 50 per cent of the Negro tenant families depended on fireplaces for heat, but in no city did more than 37 per cent of the white tenant families have to depend on them.

Again the data for larger cities are substantiated by data for the four small southern cities covered in the Study of Consumer Purchases.⁷ In those cities 64 per cent of the Negro and 40 per cent of the white nonrelief, normal families used fireplaces for heat, 36 per cent of the Negro families and 50 per cent of the white families used stoves, and none of the Negro families but 10 per cent of the white families had central-heating systems.

In the sixteen southern cities in the survey of Consumer Use of Selected Goods and Services the use of gas or electricity for cooking fuel by white and Negro families varied considerably, but in each city the whites were better off in this respect (Table 78). Negroes in some cities, however, were better off than whites in other cities. Very few southern cities were as well off in this respect as the three northern cities included in the table.

The Real Property Inventories contain a four-group classification of the dwelling units by their general condition ("in good condition,"

⁷ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 399, Table 30.

Table 79. - Per Cent of Dwelling Units in Selected Cities Which Were Reported in Need of Major Repairs or Unfit for Use, by Color of Occupants.

City	Year of Inventory	Per cent of Dwelling units in need of major repairs or unfit for use		City	Year of Inventory	Per cent of Dwelling units in need of major repairs or unfit for use	
		Negro	White			Negro	White
Hartford, Conn.	1939	29.9	2.5	Norfolk, Va.	1936	25.2	4.7
Buffalo, N.Y.	1939	36.2	8.9	(Greater) Raleigh, N.C.	1939	37.0	3.6
Philadelphia, Pa.	1939	22.9	3.5	Charlotte, N.C.	1939	44.7	24.6
Harrisburg, Pa.	1939	72.8	12.6	Spartanburg, N.C.	1936	41.6	17.8
Detroit, Mich.	1939	33.7	6.8	Atlanta, Ga.	1939	59.2	21.6
Chicago, Ill.	1939-40	5.6	2.1	Augusta, Ga.	1939	56.5	18.6
(Woodlawn Area)	1939	67.7	6.5	Savannah, Ga.	1939	54.7	11.0
Milwaukee, Wis.	1939	66.5	14.8	Birmingham, Ala.	1939-40	56.5	19.7
Alexandria, Va.	1936	41.4	20.4	New Orleans, La.	1939-40	46.8	14.1
Martinsville, Va.	1936						

Source: Unpublished tabulations, Real Property Inventories, Federal Housing Administration.

Table 80. - Per Cent of Specified Types of Dwelling Units in Selected Cities
Which Were Occupied by Negroes

City	All Dwell- ing Units	Dwelling Units		City	All Dwell- ing Units	Dwelling Units	
		In need of major repairs	Unfit for use			In need of major repairs	Unfit for use
Buffalo, N.Y.	3.0	10.1	28.1	Charlotte, N.C.	8.5	14.6	13.1
Philadelphia, Pa.	12.7	46.7	66.8	Atlanta, Ga.	36.3	57.3	81.4
Milwaukee, Wis.	1.5	10.1	51.7	Birmingham, Ala.	42.2	66.9	84.7
(Greater) Baltimore, Md.	30.6	82.1	82.0	New Orleans, La.	31.9	57.8	74.1

Source: Unpublished tabulations, Real Property Inventories, Federal
Housing Administration.

"in need of minor repairs," "in need of major repairs," and "unfit for use"). These data are based on the subjective evaluations made by the enumerators, which limit the possibilities of using them for city-to-city comparisons. It can scarcely be an accident, however, that they indicate a much greater concentration of Negro- than white-occupied dwelling units in the lower quality groups, for this difference is so consistent and usually so pronounced that it must be accepted as additional evidence of the poorer housing conditions of Negro families. The majority of the Negro-occupied dwelling units in seven out of eighteen cities were characterized as either in need of major repairs or unfit for use (Table 79). It is apparent that the slum problem in many southern cities is mainly a problem of Negro housing, for often only a minority of the inadequate dwellings have white occupants (Table 80). Even in northern cities in which only a small percentage of the population is Negro the proportion of inadequate houses occupied by Negroes is sometimes surprisingly high.

Urban housing deficiencies were more frequent in small dwelling units than in large ones (Appendix table 49). Families which lived in small dwellings and which were consequently more likely than others to suffer from overcrowding were at the same time more likely also to live in substandard units. A consequence of this relationship between size and quality of dwelling is that the race differential in regard to quality appears to be less pronounced in the data for each size group separately than is the case when the totals for all size groups are considered.

OVERCROWDING

While conditions vary from one city to another, a greater proportion of Negro than white families resides in small dwelling units in most southern cities (Appendix table 50). In such cities the typical dwelling unit for white families contains 5 to 6 rooms, while it is quite common for a 3-room unit to represent the most usual type in Negro sections. Data for six northern cities in which the "typical" Negro-occupied dwelling unit contained 4 to 6 rooms suggest that Negroes as well as whites are better off with regard to size of urban dwelling in the North than in the South.

Because Negroes more often than whites have to live in very small dwelling units and because they include a greater proportion of large households than do whites, overcrowding is more frequent in Negro than white households. While this is confirmed by the Real Property Inventory data (Table 81), there are great differences

Table 81.—Proportion of Dwellings in Selected Cities with Specified Degree of Crowding and Proportion of Persons Living in Dwellings with Specified Degree of Crowding, by Color

City	Year of inventory	Number of dwellings ^{a/} occupied by		Per cent of dwellings with specified degree of crowding				Number of persons ^{b/}		Per cent of persons living in dwellings with specified degree of crowding			
		Negro families	White families	over 1 per room	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	over 1 per room	Negro	White	over 2 per room
Hartford, Conn.	1939	1,868	41,220	21.6	13.2	1.3	0.3	6,989	149,694	34.8	22.6	3.6	0.7
Harrisburg, Pa.	1939	1,779	21,659	14.2	5.1	1.1	0.2	7,233	76,264	28.1	10.0	2.5	0.3
Philadelphia, Pa.	1939	50,848	407,662	23.9	12.4	4.4	1.3	b/	b/	b/	b/	b/	b/
Detroit, Mich.	1939	29,648	363,144	25.7	12.2	1.6	0.4	132,022	1,370,028	40.3	20.2	3.1	0.7
Chicago, Ill.													
(Woodlawn area)	1939-40	2,932	16,032	18.0	16.9	0.5	0.6	12,244	54,184	29.4	22.9	1.1	1.1
Alexandria, Va.	1939-40	1,338	6,678	21.2	12.0	2.6	0.4	5,446	25,212	38.9	20.5	6.2	0.8
Martinsville, Va.	1936	687	1,658	46.4	34.0	12.4	3.7	3,177	7,219	62.6	45.9	19.9	6.1
Norfolk, Va.	1936	12,027	21,358	26.7	10.6	3.3	0.3	45,024	80,966	43.3	18.3	7.3	0.7
Spartanburg, S. C.	1936	2,676	4,898	39.0	25.4	7.3	3.3	10,492	20,067	56.7	37.2	14.2	5.2
Augusta, Ga.	1939	8,060	9,832	37.8	26.7	7.5	3.4	26,706	36,127	56.2	36.9	14.8	6.1
Savannah, Ga.	1939	12,780	13,176	22.4	16.5	2.3	1.1	42,655	48,602	39.6	26.5	5.2	2.0

^{a/} Numbers include only those units reporting both on number of persons per room and on number of persons per unit.

The total number of persons is only approximately accurate, because it was computed from an open-ended distribution of dwelling units by number of persons per unit, using 11 persons for the "11 or more" group.

^{b/} Data not available.

Source: Unpublished tabulations, Real Property Inventories, Federal Housing Administration.

among individual cities. White families in some cities are more crowded than Negro families in other cities. In most individual cities, however, Negroes are worse off than whites. The race differential is particularly pronounced in regard to the frequency of severe crowding as measured by two or more persons per room. The proportion of the population suffering from crowding is, of course, much greater than the relative number of dwelling units in which such conditions exist, and it can be taken for granted that the pro-

Table 82. - Proportion of Dwelling Units in Selected Cities with More than 2 persons per Room, by Color and Size of Household ^{a/}

City and color	All units reported	Per cent of dwelling units with more than 2 persons per room							
		Number of persons in household							
		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
Detroit, Mich.									
Negro	1.6	0.5	0.1	0.7	0.4	2.7	2.3	9.4	20.3
White	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.6	0.3	1.1	0.9	4.1	9.5
Norfolk, Va.									
Negro	3.3	0.2	-	2.0	0.9	22.7	20.4	38.7	37.0
White	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1	1.8	1.0	5.7	8.6
Spartanburg, S. C.									
Negro	7.3	0.9	1.3	11.6	5.9	27.5	t	t	t
White	3.3	1.9	1.6	5.6	3.2	9.2	5.2	t	26.5
Augusta, Ga. ^{b/}									
Negro	7.5	6.4	3.2	11.1	9.4	54.4	54.7	t	64.5
White	3.4	2.0	0.5	5.1	3.0	26.8	20.6	32.4	25.9
Savannah, Ga. ^{b/}									
Negro	2.3	1.2	0.6	2.4	3.1	14.9	12.4	38.8	40.1
White	1.1	0.6	0.1	1.9	0.9	5.6	7.9	13.1	14.6

t Fewer than 100 cases.

^{a/} For year of inventory, see Table 81.

^{b/} Within corporate limits only.

Source: Unpublished tabulations Real Property Inventories, Federal Housing Administration.

portion of children living in cramped quarters is still greater than the proportion of the total population.

According to the National Health Survey the frequency of crowding in some cities, such as New York, Houston, and Los Angeles, was about the same for Negroes and whites, and in two cities—namely, Boston, Massachusetts, and Springfield, Missouri—whites were living in cramped quarters relatively more often than Negroes in 1935-36 (Appendix table 51). In the majority of cities, however, it was the Negroes who suffered most. The fact that overcrowding is greatest in low-income classes is clearly revealed by the data. Non-relief Negroes are sometimes less and sometimes more crowded than nonrelief whites at the lower income levels. The fact that it is not at all unusual for white families with incomes of \$3,000 or more to

live in overcrowded dwellings indicates that economic conditions are not always the reason for overcrowding. That crowding is related to the size of the household is shown clearly in Tables 82 and 83.

Table 83.- Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in 4 Small Southern Cities a/ with More than 1.5 and More than 2 Persons per Room, by Family Type, b/ 1935-36

Family type	Number of families in sample		Per cent of families with more than 1.5 persons per room		Per cent of families with more than 2.0 persons per room	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Family type I	144	239	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
II-III	155	440	18.0	2.5	6.4	0.5
IV-V	174	435	16.9	4.3	4.7	0.7

a/ Albany, Ga.; Gastonia, N. C.; Sumter, S. C.; and Griffin, Ga.

b/ For a description of family types, see p. 80.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 399, Table 36.

HOME OWNERSHIP

In 1900, 17 per cent of all Negro nonfarm homes were owned by the occupants. This figure had risen by 1930 to 26 per cent, and the absolute number of Negro nonfarm owned homes was more than two and a half times larger than in 1900, although the total number of Negro nonfarm families increased but 70 per cent.⁸ There was a similar development for whites, however, in that the proportion of white nonfarm homes which were occupied by the owners rose from 36 per cent in 1900 to 47 per cent in 1930. Although starting from a much lower level, the Negroes thus did not make much more progress than the whites, so that there was little if any improvement in their relative position. Most individual cities show a large race differential in home ownership (Table 84 and Appendix table 52), and in some cities all but 5 to 10 per cent of the Negro families are tenants.

According to available data for a few cities (Appendix table 53), it seems that there were more Negro than white home owners in 1934 for whom the mortgages covered but a small part of the value of the homes. This probably indicates that Negro owners are not considered such goods risks as white owners. Life-insurance com-

⁸ *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930*, Population Vol. VI, p. 12. The figure for 1900 probably was somewhat too low, since the tenure was unknown in the case of not less than 11 per cent of the Negro nonfarm homes in 1900. The corresponding group of Negro homes with unknown tenure was comparatively insignificant in 1930, as were the white "unknowns" in both 1900 and 1930, so that the increase in Negro home ownership probably was somewhat smaller than the census data indicate.

Table 84.—Proportion of Dwelling Units in 4 Selected Cities Occupied by Tenants and Owners, by Color

City	Date of inventory	Negro			White		
		Number of dwelling units reported	Per cent occupied by		Number of dwelling units reported	Per cent occupied by	
			Tenants	Owners		Tenants	Owners
Buffalo, N. Y.	1939	4,489	95.3	4.7	146,215	64.6	35.4
Philadelphia, Pa.	1939	62,189	89.2	10.8	429,043	54.9	45.1
Birmingham, Ala.	1939-40	29,664	85.2	14.8	40,637	59.7	40.3
New Orleans, La.	1939-40	41,533	90.0	10.0	88,581	70.3	29.7

Source: Unpublished tabulations, Real Property Inventories, Federal Housing Administration.

panies, at least in some of the southern cities, participated to only a small extent in the financing of Negro-owned homes (Appendix table 54), and it seems that Negroes more often than whites were forced to obtain a large part of their mortgage credit from individuals. Interest rates on mortgage credit were often high, particularly for Negroes. The majority of the Negro home owners in Atlanta and Birmingham in 1934 paid as much as 8 per cent or more (Appendix table 55). It appears that Negroes consistently received less satisfactory credit service than whites. It should be emphasized, however, that the evidence is fragmentary and that it refers to a period just before federally sponsored credit organizations became significant. The situation has improved in recent years, but those income groups in which most Negroes are concentrated have received less than their proportionate share of the benefits of the reforms in home financing.⁹

RENTALS

Tenant-occupied dwellings do not constitute a homogeneous group from the point of view of rental valuations. Not all tenants pay rents which are fixed according to ordinary business practices. Some are employees or ex-employees of the owner and occupy dwellings as part of their wages or for rentals which are nominal or at any rate not calculated in the same way as would have been the case had the parties not had this employer-employee relationship. The case might be similar if the tenant is a relative of the owner. Nevertheless, the average Negro family clearly pays a much lower rental than the average white family, which is entirely or mainly due to the fact that the average Negro-occupied dwelling unit is smaller and of poorer quality than the average white-occupied home (Tables 85 and 86). Rentals have some tendency to increase with increasing size of the

⁹ See p. 314.

Table 85.- Median Monthly Rental of Tenant-occupied Dwelling Units in Selected Cities

City	Year of inventory	Number of tenant-occupied dwelling units		Median monthly rental	
		Negro	White	Negro	White
Hartford, Conn.	1939	1,783	33,274	\$18.50	\$32.70
Harrisburg, Pa.	1939	1,466	13,024	23.30	30.40
Detroit, Mich.	1939	25,305	210,470	25.60	35.40
Chicago, Ill. (Woodlawn area) ..	1939-40	2,176	16,593	39.30	40.40
Alexandria, Va.	1939-40	873	3,338	15.30	36.00
Martinsville, Va.	1936	384	1,087	7.10	12.30
Norfolk, Va.	1936	9,855	12,965	11.00	26.80
Charlotte, N. C.	1939	6,666	10,949	9.30	25.40
(Greater) Raleigh, N. C.	1939	2,384	4,875	12.00	33.10
Spartanburg, S. C.	1936	2,164	3,457	7.40	13.30
Atlanta, Ga.	1939	25,425	34,659	9.80	22.50
Augusta, Ga.	1939	6,825	7,278	6.90	13.80
Savannah, Ga.	1939	11,500	9,800	8.00	19.90
(Greater) Little Rock, Ark.	1939	5,684	13,160	7.90	21.60

Sources: Unpublished tabulations, Real Property Inventories, Federal Housing Administration.

residential household, whether Negro- or white-occupied units (Appendix table 56). They also show a strong tendency to be higher the larger the number of rooms in the dwelling units (Appendix table 57). Even in dwellings of a comparable size, however, Negroes pay much lower rentals than whites. This is explained, entirely or in part, by quality differences. Whether these differences actually are so large that the claim that Negroes pay more for comparable housing facilities is justified cannot be determined from existing statistical information.¹⁰ There are some factors, however, which strongly support the assumption that these claims are justified. Negroes are looked upon as less desirable tenants, and this cannot fail to put them in a disadvantageous position when seeking leases. The unwillingness of whites to let Negroes live close to them must bring about an artificial scarcity of housing available to Negroes, particularly when there is a net immigration of Negroes to a city. Moreover, the fact that Negro homes are more crowded and have more lodgers than white homes must tend to increase the wear and tear on Negro-occupied dwellings. A third factor is the comparative extent of rent delinquency. Negroes are in arrears in regard to their rent payments

¹⁰ Only if both the quality of the dwelling units and the number of rooms per dwelling unit were kept constant could a statistical comparison between rentals in Negro- and white-occupied houses give a more conclusive answer, but there is no tabulation of rentals based on such a three-way classification (color of occupant, condition of house, and number of rooms) in the Real Property Inventories. Another approach which has been attempted is to study increases in rents which have occurred in certain neighborhoods just after they have been taken over by Negroes. Such attempts appear suggestive, but the results are not quite satisfactory since one cannot rule out the possibility that landlords previously have kept rents unusually low in order to check the tendency of white families to move away as soon as it becomes apparent that Negro families may be coming into an area.

Table 86. - Monthly Rental for Tenant-occupied Dwelling Units in 4 Selected Cities, by Color of Occupants

City	Year of inventory	Negro				White			
		Number of dwelling units reported	Per cent distribution by monthly rental			Number of dwelling units reported	Per cent distribution by monthly rental		
			Less than \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$19.99		Less than \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$19.99 or more
Buffalo, N. Y.	1939	4,272	1.8	15.6	39.0	94,240	0.7	6.2	19.8
Philadelphia, Pa.	1939	55,400	3.2	12.2	23.2	234,275	1.1	4.8	11.4
Birmingham, Ala.	1939-40	25,256	68.4	25.2	4.7	24,268	9.4	18.4	19.6
New Orleans, La.	1939-40	37,355	40.1	36.9	16.5	62,253	6.8	19.8	25.5
									73.3
									82.7
									52.6
									47.9

Source: Unpublished tabulations, Real Property Inventories, Federal Housing Administration.

Table 87.- Rent Delinquency in Selected Cities, by Color, 1933 ^{a/}

City	Negro				White			
	Number reporting on rent status	Per cent with rent not fully paid	Average months unpaid	Average amount unpaid	Number reporting on rent status	Per cent with rent not fully paid	Average months unpaid	Average amount unpaid
Trenton, N. J.	213	58.7	5	\$ 71	1,747	31.5	6	\$132
Cleveland, Ohio	2,180	56.9	7	113	24,866	27.4	7	151
Indianapolis, Ind.	408	56.1	6	74	2,743	20.1	5	101
Richmond, Va.	1,361	53.3	4	48	2,789	18.5	4	89
Atlanta, Ga.	4,051	48.4	3	33	5,369	15.4	4	73
Birmingham, Ala.	2,857	52.7	7	52	4,301	23.7	7	92
Oklahoma City, Okla.	335	50.4	4	50	3,238	13.6	4	66
Dallas, Texas	429	40.6	3	35	3,210	14.1	4	75
San Diego, Calif.	67	22.4	3	59	4,481	12.5	4	88

^{a/} Delinquency in rent is in terms of the rent charge for 1933 but does not necessarily represent arrears incurred solely in that year.

Source: David L. Wilkens, *Financial Survey of Urban Housing*, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Washington, 1937, Table 72.

to a much greater extent than are whites (Table 87). In most of the cities listed, more than 50 per cent of the Negro families were in arrears with their rent payments in 1933, while the corresponding figures for whites were only one-third to one-half as high. The average period of rent delinquency was about the same for both races. The average amounts which delinquents owed or were in arrears were, however, lower in the case of the Negro delinquents. As the average rent per dwelling unit is much lower in Negro than white sections, the arrears represent a greater proportion of the total rental in the case of Negro-occupied properties than in the case of houses in which whites reside. Since arrears in rent eventually became final losses to some extent and under all circumstances cause interest losses, they also increase property expenses. It should be remembered, however, that these data refer to all Negro and white families regardless of income and, furthermore, are based on a study for 1933, when the depression certainly had more serious effects on Negro than white families. There is no evidence that rent delinquencies were more frequent for Negro than white households of equal economic status. Thus, in so far as this factor helps to raise rents for Negroes more than for whites, it is probably because the Negro's low income status increases the financial risk for the landlord.

SEGREGATION IN NEGRO URBAN HOUSING

As already indicated, segregation is an important factor in causing the poor housing conditions of the Negro urban population.¹¹ Residential isolation is not only a problem of the Negro, however. There are a number of different groups which, for one reason or another, tend to concentrate in certain areas of a city. Poor people usually live in other sections than rich people, mainly because they have to live where rents are low but also because they are not always accepted in the better sections. Large groups of Jews, Orientals, Italians, Poles, and other immigrant groups tend to live together,

¹¹ In rural areas, too, there is residential segregation, but it does not affect the housing conditions of Negroes as much as their prospects as farmers. Since the residence of Negro tenants, sharecroppers, and farm laborers is controlled by the dominant white group, the restrictions on Negro settlement in agricultural areas relate particularly to Negro farm owners. In general only "acceptable" Negroes are allowed to buy land, and there is great reluctance toward selling the more desirable land to any Negro. (See, for example, Arthur F. Raper, *Preface to Peasantry*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1936, pp. 121-137; and Rupert B. Vance, "Racial Competition for the Land," in *Race Relations and the Race Problem*, edited by Edgar T. Thompson, Duke University Press, Durham, N. C., 1939, p. 116.)

partly for economic reasons, partly because they often are not welcome among native Americans, but partly also because they want to be together in order to cultivate their common interests, organize agencies for mutual protection, and overcome their language difficulties.

There are similar elements, of course, in the case of Negro segregation. Under any conditions Negroes would be more concentrated in slum areas than whites simply because they include such a high proportion of extremely poor families. Also many of them may prefer to live in Negro areas, even if they do not like to be forced to do so. The fact that a sizable segment of the Negro population in urban areas lives in white-dominated blocks, however, indicates that the desire to live together is by no means generally prevalent. It cannot be doubted that in both the North and the South¹² basic racial prejudices make the segregation in Negro housing much more severe than otherwise would have been the case. This factor certainly operates with much greater force in the case of the Negro than in the case of other minority groups with the possible exception of Mexicans and Orientals. Second- and third-generation Americans of Italian descent live in Italian neighborhoods to a much smaller extent than did their immigrant parents or grandparents, but for the Negro there is no such change from one generation to the other. Neither does high income make so much of a difference as in other cases; the well-to-do Negro is more likely to live in close proximity to the shacks of the poorest residents than is the white of similar economic status.

The way in which racial prejudice operates in this sphere constitutes a vicious circle. Because there is racial prejudice and because there is housing segregation, the change that occurs when a few Negroes are admitted to a white-occupied area is often much more fundamental than would have been the case under other conditions.¹⁸

¹² According to a poll taken by *Fortune Magazine* for the Carnegie Negro Study, from 77 to 87 per cent of the informants in various sections of the country were in favor of residential segregation of Negroes, based either on legal provisions or on social pressure. Only 10 to 19 per cent were against racial segregation. The New England, Middle Atlantic, and Pacific states seemed to be somewhat less favorable toward segregation than the balance of the country. The population of other northern and western regions, on the other hand, had about the same attitude as Southerners. (See Eugene L. Horowitz, "Race Attitudes," in *Characteristics of the American Negro*, edited by Otto Klineberg, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943.)

¹⁸ If there were no racial segregation in housing, it is scarcely probable that the admission of a few Negroes to a white section would start a wholesale movement of Negro families into that area. No vacancies would occur in the section as a consequence of a precipitated outmigration of white families, and Negro families

White families in that area immediately tend to move away, and Negro families living in other sections, which are the more overcrowded because of the segregative patterns, hasten to take their places. The general consciousness of such probabilities cannot fail to fortify attitudes toward segregation even among those whites who otherwise would not object to having a few well-behaved Negro families of their own social class among their neighbors.

Racial segregation in housing is of serious import in many respects. In all probability it intensifies the unsatisfactory housing conditions of the groups affected because it tends to hold them in slums or blighted areas to an even greater extent than can be explained on economic grounds only; and it may contribute to the scarcity of housing for those groups, particularly when they are increasing. It tends to keep the minority groups more or less isolated from the dominant group. This is highly significant regardless of how it is evaluated.¹⁴ It should be noted in this context that housing segregation, unlike certain other segregative practices, is as prevalent in northern communities having a heavy Negro population as in the South. Northern communities which boast of the fact that they have no legal segregation actually may have at least partial segregation in regard to schools, hospitals, and other similar institutions as a consequence of their housing segregation.

Patterns of Segregation

The most useful classification of patterns of segregation has been made by Woofter, who considered "any area with a population more than 90 per cent Negro as a concentrated Negro area, and any area with a population more than 90 per cent white as a concentrated white area."¹⁵ He has described four general groups of cities:

The first group is typified by New York and Chicago, where the concentration of Negroes is great and yet where it affects only a small part of the whole city area. In Chicago this pattern seems to be changing as the Negroes spread more southward. . . .

The second group is typified by Richmond, and includes most of the

would feel free to move to any place where they could afford to pay the rent and would not have to make the best of every opportunity to find new living space.

¹⁴ This mutual isolation oftentimes is believed to make for better race relations on the theory that minimizing contacts means minimizing conflicts. The opposing argument is that racial isolation makes for the maintenance of cultural separation and mutual ignorance and, therefore, in the long run constitutes the main cause of misunderstanding and prejudice.

¹⁵ T. J. Woofter, Jr., and Associates, *Negro Problems in Cities*, Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., Garden City, N. Y., 1928, p. 37.

large southern cities where Negroes are highly concentrated in several rather large parts of the city and lightly scattered in others, thus leaving a large proportion of the white people in areas from 10 to 90 per cent Negro. . . .

The third group is typified by Charleston, and is limited to the older southern cities and towns which have a heavy percentage of Negroes in their total population, and consequently a heavy scattering of Negroes throughout the city. . . .

Group four is composed of cities with light colored infusion, where the diffusion of Negroes affects only a very small area of the city and is somewhat scattered within this area. . . .¹⁶

In numerous studies of individual cities in which the pattern of segregation has been delineated, the results conform to this four-fold classification. Birmingham, Alabama, for example, belongs to the second type. The city has grown up out of twelve originally separate towns, each of which has contributed a blighted section or sections. As a result, 22 blighted areas and some 200 additional, scattered blocks, which are also blighted, can be distinguished. Approximately half of the Negro population is found in these areas.¹⁷

The Negroes of Richmond, Virginia, are found in seven definitely defined areas and in a number of smaller areas in almost every section of the city except the West End residential area, and even there scattered instances of Negro residence appear.¹⁸

Reid, in describing the concentration of Baltimore's colored families in a few areas, points out that such concentration "is typical of Northern and border cities and is due, in the main, to a shortage of available homes for Negroes."¹⁹

The pattern of Negro expansion in Washington, D. C., is generally descriptive of the Negro advance in the North:

Most of the communities which Negroes have invaded have been more desirable than those from which they expanded, and, in many instances, after having deteriorated these invaded communities, they have pushed on to new neighborhoods to repeat the same process. In general, it is not culturally advantageous for Negroes to move onto virgin soil. Rather, they must appropriate areas of the city which have already been developed. For when the white man abandons these communities, he leaves

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 37-38.

¹⁷ Mabel L. Walker, *Urban Blight and Slums*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1938, pp. 43-44.

¹⁸ Charles Louis Knight, *Negro Housing in Certain Virginia Cities*, The William Byrd Press, Inc., Richmond, Va., 1927, p. 36.

¹⁹ Ira De A. Reid, *The Negro Community of Baltimore*, Baltimore, Md., 1935, p. 15.

behind remnants of his culture—his homes, his churches, schools, parks, playgrounds, and apartment buildings.²⁰

In the South, expansion of Negroes is usually into vacant territory. When whites have later moved into the new developments, the Negroes have remained. Another characteristic of southern cities to be emphasized is the fact that Negroes often live near or on the premises of the families for which they work. Their presence is both traditional and a convenience, and as a result their widespread distribution is accepted.

The most comprehensive analysis to date of the racial patterns which occur in the development of cities has been made by Hoyt in *The Structure and Growth of Residential Neighborhoods in American Cities*.²¹ On the basis of data tabulated by blocks for the first sixty-four cities in which federal Real Property Inventories were made in 1934, the conclusion was reached that "the degree of non-white concentration in any city increases directly with the number and proportion of nonwhite persons in the population. Either a large nonwhite population in absolute numbers or a high proportion of nonwhite persons in the total population is necessary to produce concentrated nonwhite areas."²²

Analyzing the extent to which concentrated nonwhite blocks are "aggregated in clusters," Hoyt found that "in most cities that have a large number of nonwhite persons, either absolutely or relatively, there is a tendency to establish concentrated nonwhite areas. There are some detached colonies and a few nonwhite persons living in a thin fringe near the central body, but sharp and distinct lines of cleavage between nonwhite and white areas are very frequent."²³ In Charleston, South Carolina, however, "the blocks occupied by non-white persons are interspersed among blocks occupied by white persons almost at random, and there are few solid racial blocks."²⁴ This is in agreement with Woofter's pattern for the older southern cities.

The large nonwhite areas are characteristically found in the oldest sections of the city, which in turn usually means in proximity to the central business district. Because these are old sections, the houses

²⁰ William Henry Jones, *The Housing of Negroes in Washington, D. C.*, Howard University Press, Washington, 1929, p. 60.

²¹ Homer Hoyt, *The Structure and Growth of Residential Neighborhoods in American Cities*, Federal Housing Administration, Washington, 1939, Part I, Chap. V.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 68.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 68 and 71.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

Table 88. - Per Cent Distribution of Nonwhite Population in Blocks Having a Specified Proportion Nonwhite in 8 Groups of Cities, According to Proportion Nonwhite in the Total Population, 1934

Group	Per cent of nonwhites in total population, 1934		per cent distribution of nonwhite population in blocks				
	Range among cities	Average for group	All blocks	Less than 10 per cent nonwhite	10-49 per cent nonwhite	50-99 per cent nonwhite	100 per cent nonwhite
Group 1 <i>a/</i>	29.3-44.8	37.0	100.0	8.1	16.3	33.6	42.0
Group 2 <i>b/</i>	15.5-27.4	22.9	100.0	13.1	20.1	29.9	36.9
Group 3 <i>c/</i>	7.4-14.3	10.3	100.0	26.6	35.1	24.3	14.0
Group 4 <i>d/</i>	4.2-6.5	5.3	100.0	23.1	38.5	23.8	14.6
Group 5 <i>e/</i>	2.3-3.9	3.1	100.0	42.0	40.5	15.4	2.1
Group 6 <i>f/</i>	0.9-2.2	1.3	100.0	63.6	31.3	5.0	0.1
Group 7 <i>g/</i>	0.6-0.9	0.7	100.0	63.6	31.7	3.5	1.2
Group 8 <i>h/</i>	0.1-0.5	0.3	100.0	76.0	23.3	0.5	0.2

- a/* Charleston, S. C.; Birmingham, Ala.; Jackson, Miss.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Shreveport, La.; Atlanta, Ga.; Columbia, S. C.; Baton Rouge, La.
b/ Austin, Tex.; Greensboro, N. C.; Little Rock, Ark.; Asheville, N. C.; Richmond, Va.; Dallas, Tex.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Knoxville, Tenn.
c/ Paducah, Ky.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Wilmington, Del.; Topeka, Kans.; Wichita Falls, Tex.; Cleveland, Ohio; Frederick, Md.; Pueblo, Colo.
d/ San Diego, Calif.; Sacramento, Calif.; Trenton, N. J.; Wichita, Kans.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Egerstown, Md.; Oklahoma City, Okla.
e/ Evansville, Ohio; Wheeling, W. Va.; Decatur, Ill.; Des Moines, Iowa; Peoria, Ill.; Springfield, Mo.; Williamsport, Pa.; Seattle, Wash.
f/ Providence, R. I.; St. Paul, Minn.; Casper, Wyo.; Lansing, Mich.; Waterbury, Conn.; Butte, Mont.; Binghamton, N. Y.; Salt Lake City, Utah.
g/ Erie, Pa.; Portland, Oreg.; Syracuse, N. Y.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Worcester, Mass.; Reno, Nev.; Racine, Wis.; Boise, Idaho.
h/ Santa Fe, N. Mex.; Lincoln, Neb.; Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Kenosha, Wis.; Burlington, Vt.; Portland, Maine; Nashua, N. H.; Fargo, N. Dak.

Source: Homer Hoyt, *The Structure and Growth of Residential Neighborhoods in American Cities*, Federal Housing Administration, Washington, 1939, pp. 66-67.

have deteriorated. In some cities, however, the nonwhites live in a belt surrounding the central portion of the city.²⁵

Hoyt's figures are summarized in Table 88, where his sixty-four cities have been classified into eight groups of eight cities each by the proportion of nonwhite population. In none of the groups does as much as half of the nonwhite population live in blocks with 100 per cent nonwhite occupancy, but cities with more than about 30 per cent of the population colored come fairly close to it. On the other hand, in cities with less than 4 per cent nonwhite population only 1 or 2 per cent and sometimes an even smaller proportion of the colored population live in blocks with 100 per cent nonwhite occupancy. The majority of the colored families in the latter group of cities lives in blocks where 90 per cent or more of the population is white. Even in cities with a large colored population there is always a sizable proportion of the colored which resides among whites.

There are considerable variations within each group. Charleston, South Carolina, which has the highest proportion of nonwhites in the whole sample (45 per cent), has only 5 per cent of them living in

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

blocks with 100 per cent nonwhite occupancy and nearly 40 per cent in blocks with less than 50 per cent colored occupancy. Baton Rouge, Louisiana, constitutes a similar, although less pronounced, exception. On the other hand, Wichita, Kansas, has less than 6 per cent colored population, but more than 30 per cent of the nonwhites reside in all-colored blocks. Similar concentrations of relatively small colored populations are found in Wichita Falls, Texas, and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.²⁶

Even where there is a high degree of racial intermixture within blocks, however, it must be realized that segregation may still occur. Thus there may be individual buildings within the blocks which do not let any Negroes in, whereas others do. The whites may occupy the houses facing the streets, while Negroes live in the alleys; or the whites may occupy dwellings facing the main thoroughfare, while Negroes live on the side streets.

Hoyt's data do not show any clear-cut differences between the North and the South, but the reason for this may be that the sample does not include any northern cities with large Negro concentrations. In fact, groups 1 and 2 contain southern cities only, with the exception of Phoenix, Arizona. Neither do the data reveal any close connection between city size and racial concentration.

Methods of Enforcing Segregation

Residential segregation of Negroes whereby they have been limited with regard to the houses they might occupy has been imposed by various means. Zoning ordinances, restrictive pacts, social pressure, and acts of violence have all been utilized to enforce the will of the dominant white group.

The first legal step to enforce segregation was taken in 1910 when an ordinance was passed in Baltimore, Maryland, after a Negro family had moved into what had previously been an all-white block. This was rapidly followed by similar action in such border and southern cities as Winston-Salem and Asheville, North Carolina; Greenville, South Carolina; Birmingham, Alabama; Atlanta, Georgia; Richmond and Norfolk, Virginia; Louisville, Kentucky; St. Louis, Missouri; and Dallas, Texas.²⁷ Such ordinances varied in that some applied only to all-white and all-Negro blocks, others set up segregation districts, others declared a block white if the majority of the residents were white, and still others determined the color of the

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

²⁷ See Charles S. Johnson, *Negro Housing*, The President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership, Washington, 1932, pp. 35-37.

block in terms of ownership of the property.²⁸ Domestic servants were exempted from the provisions of the ordinances. Some ordinances were upheld by state courts, but in 1917 the Louisville ordinance was invalidated by the Supreme Court of the United States²⁹ as a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. There were various subsequent attempts, however, to pass and enforce city residential-segregation ordinances so that further test cases were carried to the Supreme Court. A New Orleans, Louisiana, ordinance was reversed by the Supreme Court in 1927, and in 1930 the court affirmed a decision of the lower court in declaring a Richmond, Virginia, ordinance unconstitutional.³⁰ In 1935 both the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Tenth District, and the Oklahoma State Supreme Court invalidated a residential-segregation ordinance in Oklahoma City to prevent Negroes from residing in a block in which the majority of the residents were white persons.³¹

As recently as 1940 the North Carolina Supreme Court held a general zoning ordinance of December 12, 1930, amended March 10, 1939, dividing Winston-Salem into white and Negro districts to be in contravention of the Fourteenth Amendment.³² With the numerous successful legal attacks upon segregation ordinances, private devices, which have not been declared subject to the Fourteenth Amendment, have tended to replace public measures.

Thus the restrictive compact or covenant as a device for enforcing segregation has been widely used in the North.³³ These compacts have been entered into by property owners and real-estate operators in a given neighborhood who have agreed not to sell, rent, lease, or otherwise convey their property to colored people for a definite period unless all agreed to the transaction. The covenant was first challenged in 1923 in Washington, D. C., when a Mrs. Irene Hand Corrigan, who had signed a covenant not to sell her property to colored persons, was restrained from disposing of a house. In the court decision in the District of Columbia it was held that the covenant "was valid

²⁸ Gilbert T. Stephenson, "The Segregation of the White and Negro Races in Cities," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, Vol. XIII, January, 1914, pp. 3-4.

²⁹ *Buchanan v. Warley*, 245 U. S. 60.

³⁰ The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, *Twenty-first Annual Report*, New York, 1930, p. 21.

³¹ Monroe N. Work, editor, *Negro Year Book*, 1937-1938, Negro Year Book Publishing Co., Tuskegee Institute, Ala., 1937, p. 139.

³² *Clinard v. City of Winston-Salem*, 217 N. C. 119. (See *American Law Reports*, Vol. 126, 1940, pp. 634-639, for annotation citing earlier decisions in other states on racial differences in zoning ordinances.)

³³ "In Chicago, it has been estimated that 80 per cent of the city is covered by such agreements." ("Iron Ring in Housing," *The Crisis*, Vol. 47, July, 1940, p. 205.)

and did not invade the constitutional rights of colored people, inasmuch as they had the right to enter into agreements to keep white persons or other persons deemed undesirable out of colored neighborhoods."⁸⁴ The case was carried to the United States Supreme Court, which refused to review it as outside its jurisdiction.

In the case of *Hansberry v. Lee* the United States Supreme Court in a unanimous opinion rendered on November 12, 1940, invalidated a restrictive covenant in Chicago which had barred Negro residents from a white area. The decision was based upon legal technicalities, however, and applied only to the particular case. It did not cover the question of the constitutionality of such residential covenants.⁸⁵ Actually, "the scope of the restrictive covenant's potential operation is broad enough to permit its use for every purpose attainable by a zoning ordinance."⁸⁶

In a study of 84 deeds covering subdivisions in some 20 states and 2 Canadian provinces, a large part of which apply to subdivisions developed since 1924, 40 deeds were found to contain racial restrictions. Of more significance is the fact that 38 of the restrictive provisions were found in the more recent deeds.⁸⁷ While the sample is small, the restrictions are found rather generally in subdivisions near eastern and northern cities having a heavy Negro migration during the 1920's. It is not known to what extent white residential areas actually are covered by such restrictions in the deeds. It can be taken for granted that the coverage is by no means complete, but it appears that the practice may be spreading. While the restrictions are private measures, they can be exceedingly effective if used on a large scale.

Fairly effective also are the general attitudes among real-property owners and real-estate agencies and the informal understanding which exists among them. As a result, Negroes find themselves barred from new residential developments or from purchasing properties for sale in certain areas. In the South particularly few whites would even consider selling property in the better residential areas to Negroes. If informal measures fail, pressure will in many instances

⁸⁴ Monroe N. Work, editor, *Negro Year Book*, 1931-1932, Negro Year Book Publishing Co., Tuskegee Institute, Ala., 1931, p. 64.

⁸⁵ See I. F. Stone, "The Rat and Res Judicata," *The Nation*, Vol. 151, November 23, 1940, p. 495; and "Supreme Court Upsets Chicago Covenant Case," *The Crisis*, Vol. 47, December, 1940, p. 390.

⁸⁶ M. T. Van Hecke, "Zoning Ordinances and Restrictions in Deeds," *Yale Law Journal*, Vol. XXXVII, February, 1928, p. 413.

⁸⁷ Helen C. Monchow, *The Use of Deed Restrictions in Subdivision Development*, The Institute for Research in Land Economics and Public Utilities, Chicago, 1928, p. 50.

be exerted by banks and other credit institutions which are financially interested in neighborhoods threatened by infiltration of Negroes.

There are also the measures taken by the general public. That violence and intimidation play a large role in keeping Negroes out of white-dominated areas is well known. Bombings, racial propaganda, and mob violence have been widely, if sporadically, reported.

Current trends appear to be leading toward more rigid segregation than in the past. Not only are the formal restrictions which have been upheld by the courts apparently increasing but also housing developments resulting from public planning are organized for Negroes or whites separately.³⁸

Factors Limiting Segregation


But in spite of all this Negroes have succeeded in entering areas which previously have been occupied by whites. How can this happen?

In the first place, segregation is seldom complete. It is at least easier for Negroes to move around in slum areas than in more desirable sections, and most Negroes cannot afford to live in other places than slums anyway. The white sections may not be entirely covered by restrictive covenants. If there are loopholes, a few Negroes manage to slip in. Intimidation may keep most Negroes away from white areas but not all, and the few make a way for the rest. When it comes to attacks upon the financial interests of property owners and banks, the Negro's best ally is one of the major factors in segregation: that so many whites do not like to live close to him. Usually white residents have moved out when Negroes have begun to move into an area, and serious conflicts resulting from the process have on the whole been infrequent. In general, when an area is supposed to be threatened by Negro infiltration, property values may fall and rents go down, but in spite of that white tenants and buyers stay away. Again the character of a neighborhood may change so radically while restrictions are in effect that property owners would be better off financially if they could open up the area to Negroes. If it eventually becomes apparent that there is no other possibility of safeguarding financial interests than by accepting the Negro, even a fairly watertight system of restrictive covenants can break down. Economic interests will overcome personal prejudices. When the process of admitting Negroes once starts, even the most adamant property owners tend to accept the changing situation.

³⁸ See "Housing Policies," Chap. XVIII, p. 310.

PART II

SOCIAL WELFARE



Chapter XI

INTRODUCTION

Programs of social welfare are particularly significant with regard to the Negro because of the large proportion of Negro families with exceedingly low incomes and inadequate levels of living. Thus all types of public assistance are of major import for the Negro group.

In attempting to attain economic security, the Negro has to cope with many handicaps besides the basic one of widespread racial discrimination. Poorly equipped as a result of limited education and lack of skills, he is more circumscribed than the white worker with regard to the jobs for which he can qualify. Likewise, with the omnipresent limitations which he faces, there is little incentive for ambitious striving toward higher rungs on the economic ladder. That part of the Negro population which consists of recent migrants from farms to cities faces the added difficulty of adjusting to the special requirements of the urban industrial and commercial economy. On the other hand, the rural-farm Negro has been even more subject to the hazards of the cash-crop system of southern agriculture than the white farmer, and the low rate of farm ownership has added greatly to his economic insecurity. The fact that the sharecropping system rarely provides for the development of self-reliance and individual initiative acts as a further limiting factor in the Negro's efforts to adjust to the changing structure of southern agriculture with its increasing emphasis on the production of food crops in contrast to the traditional cotton and tobacco culture.

The depression of the thirties caught the superfluous agricultural population between two dilemmas. Rural overpopulation was even more intense than before, and at the same time the cities ceased to provide jobs to absorb hordes of rural migrants. The situation was much worse, however, for the Negro than the white worker. The reductions in cash-crop acreage in all probability affected him more seriously than the white farming population; but urban unemployment also hit him much harder than whites. The effects were the

more serious in the case of the Negro since he already lived so close to the minimum level of existence. The only major change which somewhat brightened the economic outlook for the Negro during this period was the development of large-scale public-relief programs during the early thirties. Today more Negroes obtain their main livelihood from relief, it is believed, than from any single productive occupation except agriculture and domestic and personal service. There is scarcely any doubt that public relief has helped Negroes much more than whites. This is so in spite of the fact that relief standards tend to be relatively low in the South, that it is often more difficult for Negroes than whites in similar economic circumstances to obtain relief, and that relief benefits in many instances are lower for Negroes than whites.

As a result of the large-scale need for public assistance which arose during the depression, public-welfare programs have had a rapid development and have branched out in many directions to meet the problems of destitute people. The primary emphasis in this Part is upon relief in the narrower sense; namely upon direct- and work-relief programs, categorical assistance, and the distribution of surplus commodities. In addition, the program of the Farm Security Administration and housing policies are discussed because of their particular significance with regard to the Negro.

That many other aspects of public assistance are touched upon only indirectly or not at all is recognized, but such omissions occur largely because of the difficulty of obtaining factual material on the basis of race. Perhaps the most important single item which has been excluded from the subsequent discussion is the old-age and survivors' insurance system. Since this system is administered entirely by the federal government, there can scarcely be any elements of direct racial discrimination in it; but it is so constructed that Negroes, nevertheless, benefit much less than whites. This is mainly due to limited coverage. Only employees and wage earners in certain specific industries are within the system.¹ The groups not covered—mainly agriculture, domestic-service groups, and self-employed persons—included 65 per cent of all colored workers in 1930, whereas the corresponding proportions for native white and foreign-born

¹ These limitations have often been criticized. "This linking of general social reforms to the labor market dominates the whole field of social policy in some countries. Old-age insurance and health insurance have sometimes been developed on this basis. Here some short circuit in thinking must be at work which involves the position that industrialism is to blame for modern economic problems, so that they have to be remedied by special measures for those connected with industry" (Alva Myrdal, *Nation and Family*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1941, p. 134).

white workers were 45 and 37 per cent, respectively.² Yet in 1937 approximately 2,240,000 Negro workers were covered by old-age and survivors' insurance. They constituted 6.9 per cent of all covered workers. The corresponding proportion for Negro males was 8.0 per cent and for Negro females 4.2 per cent. Only 377,000 Negro women workers were within the system.³ The benefits, which range from \$10 to \$85, depend upon the number of dependents, the years of coverage, and the average previous wage income. Because of the last factor they must be lower on the average for Negroes than for whites, but even persons with low previous incomes may receive benefits which are rather high compared with what Negroes in many states may receive under most other programs of public assistance. The benefit for a married couple without children after five years of coverage, for instance, is \$31.50 if the average monthly wage has been \$50, and \$39.37 if the wage has been \$100. Survivors of fully insured workers receive benefits which amount to three-fourths of the benefit to the worker in the case of an aged widow or a widow with a dependent child and one-half of the worker's benefit in the case of each dependent child under eighteen years of age.⁴

The situation is similar in the case of unemployment compensation, which has about the same limitation in coverage as old-age insurance. Workmen's compensation, which is administered entirely by the state, has a coverage estimated at only 40 per cent of all gainful workers,⁵ since agriculture and domestic service are among industries most often excluded from the system.⁶ Negroes in this case also are in a disadvantageous position. It is probable that the wide state-by-state variations in coverage and minimum-benefit standards⁷ make this tendency even more pronounced. Mississippi still does not have any workmen's compensation system in operation.⁸

Public health and medical care likewise are omitted topics. An

² W. S. Woytinsky, *Labor in the United States*, Social Science Research Council, Washington, 1938, pp. 42-43 and 208.

³ Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, *Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance Statistics: Employment and Wages of Covered Workers: 1938*, Washington, 1940, pp. 16-18.

⁴ Lyle L. Schmitter and Betti C. Goldwasser, "The Revised Benefit Schedule under Federal Old-Age Insurance," *Social Security Bulletin*, Vol. 2, September, 1939, pp. 4 and 9.

⁵ Russell Sage Foundation, *Social Work Year Book, 1941*, edited by Russell H. Kurtz, New York, 1941, p. 612.

⁶ *Idem.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 611.

⁸ Virginius Dabney, *Below the Potomac*, A Book about the New South. D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc., New York, 1942, p. 114.

as yet unpublished monograph written for this series⁹ contains information concerning certain aspects of these problems. Although the situation has improved during recent years, Negroes in large parts of the country are less well cared for than are whites, and their rates of sickness are much higher.

Another significant excluded item concerns the care of delinquent, destitute, and otherwise handicapped children. This problem certainly is much more significant in the Negro than the white group, since Negroes show much higher rates of illegitimacy and juvenile delinquency, since they have a higher proportion of broken families, and since relatively few families have enough stability in economic and other respects to provide good private foster homes. Such limited data as are available in published reports suggest that in many states the efforts made to give institutional care to children are much weaker in the case of Negroes than they are in the case of whites.¹⁰

A more complete description of the Negro's place in the present system of public welfare should also have included a discussion of the major gaps in the system. Prominent among those gaps is the present paucity of public provisions for the care of transients and

⁹ Samuel A. Stouffer, Lyonel C. Florant, Harold F. Dorn, and Dudley Kirk.

¹⁰ In Virginia during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, an average of 402 white and 463 colored delinquent children were in industrial schools, where the per capita expenditure for operation and maintenance was more than 50 per cent higher for white than Negro children. Only 68 and 49 per cent, respectively, of all the newly committed juvenile delinquency cases were referred to these schools (*Biennial Report for the State Department of Public Welfare for Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1938 and June 30, 1939*, pp. 74-77 and 113). The training school for delinquent boys in Georgia was considered to be in poor condition and had only 155 boys on June 30, 1940, less than half of whom were Negroes. Of all delinquent, neglected, and physically or mentally handicapped children who had been accepted for child-welfare services during the budget year 1939-40 by the State Department of Welfare, only 17 per cent were Negroes (Georgia Department of Public Welfare, *Official Report for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1939, to June 30, 1940*, pp. 80 and 199-200). In Arkansas only 6 per cent of the children under the care or supervision of the Department of Welfare in June, 1940, were colored (State of Arkansas, *Annual Report of the Department of Public Welfare for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1940*, p. 33). Mississippi did not yet have a reform school for colored children by 1939 (*Biennial Report of the Department of Public Welfare, State of Mississippi, for the Period July 1, 1937, through June 30, 1939*, p. 27). Alabama, on September 30, 1940, had 392 white and 362 Negro children in training and industrial schools for juvenile delinquents (State of Alabama, Department of Public Welfare, *Annual Report for the Fiscal Year October 1, 1939-September 30, 1940*, p. 76). The authorities in North Carolina considered the existing facilities in 1940 adequate for white children but deplored the inadequacy of the facilities for Negro juvenile delinquents; there was no reform school at all for colored girls (*Biennial Report of the North Carolina State Board of Charities and Public Welfare, July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1940*, pp. 118-119).

migrants,¹¹ apart from the efforts to lend some assistance to migratory farm workers.¹² This problem is highly significant for the Negro population because of its heavy migration and its extensive relief needs. The end of the present war boom certainly will cause an urgent need for new efforts in this field since great numbers of workers will have lost settlement in their home communities without having gained settlement in their new places of residence.

This enumeration, far from complete, of major omissions has been made in order to remind the reader of the fact that a destitute person in this country has more sources of public assistance or other benefits available than those which are primarily considered in this volume. It does not appear, however, that the selection of topics to be discussed in subsequent pages has been made in such a way as to make the picture of the Negro's relative position unduly dark.

¹¹ Regarding the extensive federal transient program during the period 1933-35, see John N. Webb, *The Transient Unemployed*, Research Monograph III, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1935. The present problem is extensively discussed in *Interstate Migration. Report of the Select Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens*, 77th Congress, 1st Session, House Report No. 369, Washington, 1941.

¹² See p. 308.

Chapter XII

THE NEGRO ON RELIEF DURING THE EARLIER PERIOD OF THE NEW DEAL

The year 1935 constitutes a dividing line in the history of relief policies under the New Deal. The Federal Emergency Relief Administration was liquidated at the end of that year, and new federal agencies for the administration of special programs, such as work relief, rural rehabilitation, youth, social insurances, and public assistance for the aged, the blind, and dependent children, were created. Through these changes differentiation in relief policies for special groups was established, or at least the administrative setup was adjusted to a differentiation of policies that had begun earlier. The changes meant, furthermore, a certain stabilization of programs and policies as it was clear that from now on federal participation in public assistance was to continue and to continue on a relatively permanent basis rather than as a temporary emergency and a means of maintaining purchasing power in a depression. They meant, on the other hand, that federal participation would be limited to the special programs already referred to, some of which (including old age and survivors' insurance, work and youth programs, and the Farm Security programs) would be operated mainly or entirely by the federal government, whereas others (particularly unemployment compensation and the special types of public assistance) would be administered primarily by state and local governments with federal financial aid. General relief once again became not only an administrative but also a financial obligation of the state and local governmental units. Only in so far as it was supplemented or substituted for by surplus commodities and through the grant program of the Farm Security Administration did the federal government continue to contribute to general relief.

A further reason for emphasizing the changes which occurred in 1935 is that since most of the federal efforts up until 1935 were

administered by one single agency, the main exception being the activities of the Civil Works Administration during the winter of 1933-34, the data on relief were of a more general nature than those for more recent years, which refer to specialized programs. This section deals, therefore, with the Negro on relief prior to the differentiation of types of assistance.

GENERAL INCIDENCE OF RELIEF

Data presented in the analysis of income,¹ based primarily on the Consumer Purchases Study of 1935-36, showed sharp and consistent differences in the incidence of relief between the urban North, the urban South, and the rural South, with rates highest in the urban North and lowest in the rural South. Moreover, in the rural South the proportion of normal families on relief varied significantly for farm operators (owners and tenants) and sharecroppers from one section to another. In the farm group relief rates were consistently lower for Negroes than whites in spite of the fact that the proportions of families with very low incomes were far higher among Negro than white farm families. In southern cities and villages, on the other hand, the Negro relief rate usually was higher than the white rate. In most cases from more than one-tenth to almost one-third of all normal Negro families received relief at some time during the year covered by the survey. Even so, the proportions of nonrelief families with incomes of less than \$250 during 1935-36 were so much higher for Negroes than whites that there can be little doubt that the means tests applied to Negroes were more severe than those applied to white applicants for relief.

The situation in the urban North seems to have been different in this respect. In no one of the four northern cities for which data on Negroes were obtained in the Consumer Purchases Study was the proportion of nonrelief normal families with less than \$500 per year substantially higher among Negroes than whites. The price for obtaining relatively uniform relief standards in this sense was high. About 40 per cent of the Negro normal families in the four cities were on relief and, if broken families were included, the proportion would be even higher. The somewhat larger sample of cities in the National Health Survey indicates that the proportion of Negro families on relief in the urban North was seldom lower than one-third and in some cases it was as high as 50 to 60 per cent.

The first comprehensive study of the relief population under the

¹ Chapter V.

New Deal was made in October, 1933, about half a year after the Federal Emergency Relief Administration had been inaugurated.² In that month the relief incidence among Negroes for the country as a whole was 17.8 per cent or almost twice as high as the corresponding white rate of 9.5 per cent (Table 89). This difference was due to

Table 89. - Negro and White Relief Population, October, 1933, as Per Cent of Total Negro and White Population, 1930, in Total United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930, by Residence

Residence and state	Per cent on relief		Residence and state	Per cent on relief	
	Negro	White		Negro	White
United States total	17.8	9.5	Urban South (cont.)		
Urban	26.7	9.6	Mississippi	18.4	12.0
Rural	10.9	9.3	Arkansas	26.9	13.7
Urban North			Louisiana	33.0	10.7
New York	25.4	9.8	Oklahoma	27.9	12.3
New Jersey	29.8	7.9	Texas	16.3	8.5
Pennsylvania	35.1	11.7			
Ohio	39.5	10.8	Rural South		
Indiana	31.0	10.3	Maryland	3.0	3.8
Illinois	35.6	10.7	Virginia	1.6	1.6
Michigan	28.8	11.6	West Virginia	12.5	25.8
Missouri	25.1	6.1	North Carolina	8.3	6.7
Urban South			South Carolina	25.1	19.8
Maryland	26.5	13.6	Georgia	6.1	8.7
Virginia	9.8	6.9	Florida	26.9	26.6
West Virginia	32.5	14.6	Kentucky	12.0	22.5
North Carolina	19.6	6.4	Tennessee	3.2	7.7
South Carolina	39.1	18.8	Alabama	17.7	18.0
Georgia	22.4	8.7	Mississippi	7.6	14.1
Florida	46.7	15.1	Arkansas	4.7	8.9
Kentucky	16.5	8.3	Louisiana	9.6	17.3
Tennessee	11.2	6.3	Oklahoma	26.7	20.2
Alabama	22.4	11.4	Texas	2.9	3.3

Source: Federal Emergency Relief Administration, *Unemployment Relief Census*, October, 1933, Report No. 2, Washington, 1934, pp. 14 and 15.

the effect of urban areas in which the proportion of all persons on relief was almost three times as high for Negroes (26.7 per cent) as for whites (9.6 per cent).³ In rural areas, on the other hand, there was a comparatively small racial difference with roughly one-tenth of both the white and Negro population on relief.

Comparing the three residential groups of urban North, urban South, and rural South (including only states with 100,000 Negroes or more in 1930), certain characteristic differences are found. There was greater uniformity in the urban North in that Negro relief rates ranged only from about 25 to 40 per cent in the various states and white rates from 6 to 12 per cent. In the South, on the other hand, urban rates ranged from 10 to 47 per cent for Negroes in the different states and from 6 to 19 per cent for whites. State variations were

² Federal Emergency Relief Administration, *Unemployment Relief Census*, October 1933, Report Nos. 1-3, Washington, 1934-1935.

³ In all percentages based on the total population in 1930, changes since then must be kept in mind. The usual result is to make relief rates somewhat too high.

even more pronounced in southern rural areas, ranging from 2 to 27 per cent for both Negroes and whites.

In the urban North, Negro relief rates in October, 1933, were consistently three to four times higher than the corresponding white rates. They were two to three times higher than white rates in the urban South except in Virginia and Mississippi, where they were only about one and one-half times as high. The rural South showed the greatest lack of uniformity in this respect with relief rates lower for Negroes than for whites in ten of the fifteen states considered, higher only in 4 states, and the same in 1 state; namely, Virginia. At that time, however, Virginia had such an extremely low general relief incidence in rural areas (1.6 per cent) that racial differences could hardly matter.

The next comprehensive study of the relief population was made in March, 1935, when a census of workers on relief, 16-64 years of age, was taken.⁴ The total number of economic heads of families in this relief population was 4,158,000, of which 602,000 were Negroes and 3,409,000 were whites. If it is assumed that the proportion of family heads 65 years of age and over in the relief population was approximately the same in March, 1935, as in October, 1933,⁵ there was a total of approximately 654,000 Negro families and 3,787,000 white families on relief in the later month. The numbers had increased from 580,000 Negro families and 2,550,000 white families in October, 1933,⁶ or 13 per cent and 49 per cent, respectively. The proportion Negroes constituted of all families on relief decreased from 18 per cent in October, 1933, to 15 per cent in March, 1935.

The South showed the same lack of uniformity in relief rates for both whites and Negroes in March, 1935, as in October, 1933. Ten of the southern states had lower rural relief rates for Negroes than whites (Table 90). Even in Georgia, in which the direction of relief had been taken over by a federal administrator,⁷ there was a lower Negro rural rate (5.5 per cent) than white rate (10.6 per cent).

To what extent can the state-by-state variations both in absolute relief rates for Negroes and whites and in Negro-white differentials

⁴ See Philip M. Hauser, *Workers on Relief in the United States in March 1935, A Census of Usual Occupations* (abridged edition), Works Progress Administration, Washington, January, 1937.

⁵ According to the *Unemployment Relief Census, October 1933*, Report No. 3, *op. cit.*, p. 36, 10 per cent of the white and 8 per cent of the Negro heads of relief families were 65 years of age and over.

⁶ *Unemployment Relief Census, October 1933*, Report No. 2, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

⁷ Rebecca Farnham and Irene Link, *Effects of the Works Program on Rural Relief*, Research Monograph XIII, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, p. 48.

Table 90. — Negro and White Economic Needs of Families under 65 Years of Age on Relief, March, 1935, as Per Cent of Total Negro and White Families, 1930, by Residence, Geographic Divisions, and States ^{a/}

Residence, division, and state	Per cent of families on relief		Residence, division, and state	Per cent of families on relief	
	Negro	White		Negro	White
United States total	21.5	12.8			
Urban North			Urban South (cont.)		
New England division	33.5	13.3	Oklahoma	46.5	15.0
Middle Atlantic division	55.6	14.5	Texas	27.0	10.9
East North Central division	53.5	13.3			
West North Central division	44.9	13.9	Rural South		
Urban South			Delaware	4.6	1.6
Delaware	36.9	9.1	Maryland	13.9	6.1
Maryland	30.2	6.2	Virginia	8.0	7.5
District of Columbia	36.3	4.3	West Virginia	9.6	19.6
Virginia	22.3	7.7	North Carolina	8.0	7.3
West Virginia	40.5	18.3	South Carolina	9.4	9.9
North Carolina	28.9	11.3	Georgia	5.5	10.6
South Carolina	24.2	15.5	Florida	7.6	13.6
Georgia	25.4	13.3	Kentucky	10.9	17.2
Florida	23.2	10.2	Tennessee	4.3	11.5
Kentucky	15.4	9.0	Alabama	3.7	4.5
Tennessee	17.0	12.1	Mississippi	3.9	13.0
Alabama	23.6	13.5	Arkansas	5.2	13.1
Mississippi	15.8	16.8	Louisiana	2.2	3.6
Arkansas	23.3	13.6	Oklahoma	42.5	25.2
Louisiana	32.6	11.2	Texas	15.1	13.0

^{a/} This table is not directly comparable with Table 89 since it is based on the number of families, whereas Table 89 is based on the number of persons.

Sources: Philip M. Kenseer, *Workers on Relief in the United States in March, 1935*, Vol. 1, A Census of Usual Occupations, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, pp. 102-103; and *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930*, Population Vol. VI, State table 4.

be explained on the basis of differences in need? It is, of course, impossible to answer this question in numerical terms, but it is obvious that the need factor, particularly in rural areas of the South, represents only part of the explanation. Other factors, and in many instances the most significant ones, are discrepancies in administrative practices and standards. This impression is confirmed by the data from the Consumer Purchases Study and the National Health Survey which show that even among cities there are differences in relief rates which cannot be accounted for solely on the basis of income differences.

Within the rural areas of particular states there was such a great lack of uniformity in relief rates in March, 1935, that it must be assumed that it was caused in substantial part by variations in administrative standards. A special tabulation of data from the 1935 census of workers on relief reveals that the proportion of white families on relief in rural counties in North Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, and eastern Texas varied from 3.5 per cent to 29.2 per cent and that the corresponding proportions of Negro families varied from no families on relief to 31.6 per cent (Table 91).⁸ The lowest Negro relief rate in the rural counties of Georgia was zero and the highest was 21.9 per cent; the corresponding extremes in Mississippi were 0.5 and 30.1 per cent, respectively. On the whole the variations were somewhat greater for Negroes than for whites in the rural counties of each of the four states studied.

That there were wide discrepancies also in regard to the Negro-white differentials is shown in Table 92. In 21 of the 90 counties studied in Georgia the Negro relief rates were less than one-fourth of the corresponding white rates, but there were also a few counties in which the proportion of families on relief was substantially higher for Negroes than for whites. In 3 rural counties in eastern Texas the Negro relief rate was less than one-third that of white families, but at the other extreme in 5 counties the Negro rate was more than four times the white rate.

The lack of uniformity cannot be explained by differences in financial resources of the communities as the financial burden was largely

⁸ Table 90 indicates that in the rural areas of North Carolina the relief rate for Negroes in March, 1935, was only slightly higher than for whites, but Tables 91 and 92 seem to show a more significant difference. This is largely explained by the fact that counties with small proportions of Negro families in 1930 had high Negro relief rates in March, 1935. Furthermore, the data are not comparable in that a large part of the rural population resided in counties which, because they had centers of 2,500 or more, were not included in Tables 91 and 92.

Table 91. - Rural Counties a/ in Selected Southern States, by Negro and White Relief Incidence, March, 1935

State and color	All counties	Number of counties in which Negro and white economic heads of families on relief, March 1935, constituted specified proportions of all Negro and white families, 1930											
		Less than 1.0 per cent	1.0-4.9 per cent	5.0-9.9 per cent	10.0-14.9 per cent	15.0-19.9 per cent	20.0-24.9 per cent	25.0-29.9 per cent	30.0 per cent or more				
North Carolina	33	-	2	10	6	6	5	3	1				
Negro	33	-	8	11	8	4	2	-	-				
White													
Georgia	90	6 ^{b/}	38	30	12	3	1	-	-				
Negro	90	-	2	24	39	22	3	-	-				
White													
Mississippi	46	3	25	12	3	1	1	-	1				
Negro	46	-	-	10	21	10	3	2	-				
White													
Eastern Texas	43	-	4	8	5	9	7	6	4				
Negro	43	-	9	7	13	4	6	4	-				
White													

a/ Counties with no center of 2,500 population or more (in Texas with no center of 3,000 or more) and with at least 100 Negro families in 1930.

b/ Two of these counties, Brantley and Echols, had no Negroes on relief, although an appreciable proportion (11.6 and 18.8 per cent, respectively) of the white families were receiving public assistance.

Sources: Philip M. Hauser, Workers on Relief in the United States in March, 1935, Vol. 1, A Census of Usual Occupations, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, Table 16A; and Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. VI, State table 19.

Table 92. - Rural Counties in Selected Southern States, by Relation between Negro and White Relief Incidence, March, 1935

Relation of Negro relief incidence to white relief incidence	North Carolina	Georgia	Mississippi	Eastern Texas
All rural counties -----	33	90	46	43
<u>Lower</u>				
Less than one-fourth -----	-	21	16	-
One-fourth to one-third -----	-	17	7	3
One-third to one-half -----	-	17	11	2
One-half to nine-tenths -----	4	26	9	5
About equal <u>a/</u> -----	6	3	1	5
<u>Higher</u>				
Not more than twice -----	17	6	2	14
Twice but not more than three times -----	5	-	-	6
Three times but not more than four times -----	1	-	-	2
More than four times -----	-	-	-	6

a/ Counties in which the Negro relief incidence was less than 10 per cent lower or higher than the white relief incidence.

Source: Table 91.

carried by the federal government.⁹ Uniformity in relief standards is difficult to develop under any circumstances. It was the more difficult in communities most of which had had little or no experience in public-relief administration until a few years earlier and in which public sentiment was probably more concerned about the question of whether relief in general was for the best interests of the people than with the problem of consistency in the handling of public-welfare activities. The establishment of a fixed pattern was the more difficult in the South in view of the conflict between the traditional attitudes, on the one hand, and federal policies together with the special requirements in an emergency situation, on the other.¹⁰

⁹ Arthur E. Burns and Edward A. Williams, *A Survey of Relief and Security Programs*, Works Progress Administration, Washington, May, 1938, pp. 81-82.

¹⁰ A sample study in the Alabama cotton region as of December, 1933, which was based on data from almost 900 landlords with over 4,000 tenants in representative counties (Harold Hoffsommer, *Landlord-Tenant Relations and Relief in Alabama*, Series II, No. 9, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Washington, November 14, 1935) throws an interesting side light on the conflict between prevailing local attitudes and the problems of the emergency situation.

"The conventional attitude of the landlord was that the tenant, and particularly the sharecropper, was dependent on him for direction and aid. More than nine out of every ten landlords interviewed stated that it was one of the functions of the landlord to maintain his tenants, if possible, in times of distress. At first sight it would seem difficult to reconcile this statement with the fact that approximately 80 per cent of the landlords actually wanted their tenants to get on relief. The contradiction is partially explained, however, by the fact that 50 per cent of the landlords reported financial inability to care for their tenants" (p. 1).

"Approximately 30 per cent of the tenants interviewed stated that their landlords had helped them to get on the relief rolls" (p. i).

"Although no data are available on the subject, it is fairly certain that a con-

Table 93. - Relief Incidence in Counties Representative of Selected Rural Areas, ^{a/} by Color, October, 1933-October, 1935

Area and color	Rural relief cases in specified month per 100 rural families in 1930				
	October 1933 ^{c/}	June 1934 ^{d/}	October 1934 ^{e/}	February 1935 ^{e/}	June 1935 ^{e/} / October 1935 ^{e/}
All areas - - - - -	9.0	17	13.7	15.2	10.5
Eastern Cotton - - - - -	12.4	9	11.3	8.5	5.7
Negro - - - - -	12.9	4	f/	7.1	4.8
White - - - - -	12.0	7	f/	9.4	6.3
Western Cotton - - - - -	6.1	10	21.2	24.9	11.0
Negro - - - - -	5.3	16	f/	39.5	14.1
White - - - - -	6.2	10	f/	21.4	10.2

^{a/} The data for June 1934 are based on a sample of 65 counties representing 6 rural areas; of which 14 counties are in the Eastern Cotton area and 7 counties in the Western Cotton area. All other data are based on a sample of 138 counties representing 9 rural areas, of which 32 counties are in the Eastern Cotton area and 12 counties in the Western Cotton area.

^{b/} Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. VI, State table 20.

^{c/} Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Unemployment Relief Census, October 1933, Report No. 2, Washington, 1934, Table 9.

^{d/} P. G. Beck and M. C. Forster, Six Rural Problem Areas, Relief - Resources - Rehabilitation, Research Monograph I, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Washington, 1935, pp. 27 and 51.

^{e/} A. R. Mangus, Changing Aspects of Rural Relief, Research Monograph XIV, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, pp. 24 and 123.

^{f/} Data not available.

In addition to the comprehensive surveys of October, 1933, and March, 1935, a series of sample studies made by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and the Work Projects Administration provide relief data by race.¹¹ In representative rural areas of the Eastern Cotton area, including portions of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas, the relief rate was consistently lower from June, 1934, to October, 1935, than for rural areas in the country as a whole for both whites and Negroes (Table 93). In addition, the proportion of rural Negro families on relief was considerably lower than the proportion of rural white families. In the Western Cotton area, comprising portions of Oklahoma and Texas, total rural relief rates were higher than the national average for the same period. This was largely due to the severe drought of 1934 and its aftermath, which left great numbers of families destitute. Moreover, relief rates were consistently higher for Negro than white families in the Western Cotton area with about two out of five Negro rural families receiving relief during the winter of 1934-35.

During 1935 there was a gradual decline in rural relief rolls. This decrease was partly compensated for by the simultaneous development of the rural rehabilitation program¹² and the work program of the Works Progress Administration, which absorbed large numbers of needy families. In the cotton areas the decline in relief rates was more pronounced for Negroes than for whites.

Another study, made as of May, 1934, gives the proportions of Negro and white families on relief in 79 cities. From this total, 30 cities, of which 10 were in the North, 7 in border states, and 13 in the South, were selected for study¹³ (Appendix table 58). The proportions of families in the Negro and white populations that were on relief were as follows:

siderable number of unscrupulous landlords used government relief as a means of furnishing their tenants with goods which could and should have been furnished by themselves. On the other hand, nearly 40 per cent of the landlords who had tenants on relief were opposed to governmental aid for their tenants on the grounds of its demoralizing effects upon them. . . . Among the landlords who had no tenants on relief, more than 70 per cent stated that they objected to relief because of its demoralizing influences on the tenant" (p. 4).

¹¹ Formerly the Works Progress Administration.

¹² See p. 295.

¹³ North and South in this case have not been defined in accordance with census practice in that a group of border states, including Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, has been introduced. (See Katherine D. Wood, *Urban Workers on Relief*, Part II, Research Monograph IV, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1936, p. 72.)

Per cent of families on relief, May, 1934

	<i>Negro</i>	<i>White</i>
Northern cities.....	52.2	13.3
Border-state cities.....	51.8	10.4
Southern cities.....	33.7	11.4

Thus the proportion of Negro urban families on relief as well as of white urban families was found to be higher in the North than in the South. At the same time the differential between Negro and white rates was greater in the North than in the South. Also there was less variation in relief rates among northern cities than in southern and border-state cities. In 6 of the 10 northern cities in the sample from 10 to 20 per cent of the white families and from 50 to 65 per cent of the Negro families were on relief in May, 1934.¹⁴

The fact that Negro families constituted between 70 and 80 per cent of all households receiving public assistance in Washington, D. C., Norfolk, Virginia, and Charlotte, North Carolina, in May, 1934, emphasizes the economic liability that Negro relief cases represent in cities in which Negroes constitute a large proportion of the population and the relief agencies recognize their need for assistance. Furthermore, not only was the Negro relief rate much higher in most northern and border cities than the white rate but also in such southern cities as Norfolk, Virginia, Charlotte, North Carolina, and New Orleans, Louisiana, the Negro relief rate was four to seven times the white rate. On the other hand, in several border-state and southern cities—i. e., Bowling Green, Kentucky, Gastonia, North Carolina, and Charleston, South Carolina—there was little difference in the relief incidence of white and Negro families. The greatest difference in rates was found in Washington, D. C., in which almost nine times as many Negro families proportionately as white families were on relief.

An urban study based on a sample of 13 cities which included 2 southern cities (Houston, Texas, and Atlanta, Georgia) and 1 border-state city (Baltimore, Maryland) contains information on relief turnover. The relief incidence in the 13 cities showed a very small decline from December, 1934 (35.4 per cent for Negroes and 11.6 per cent for whites), to December, 1935 (32.5 per cent and 10.3 per cent, respectively).¹⁵ The number of persons obtaining relief for the first time during 1935 as a percentage of the total population was only 3.8 for Negroes and 1.9 for whites,¹⁶ which indicates that about

¹⁴ New York, N. Y.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Evansville, Ind.; Chicago, Ill.; and Benton Harbor, Mich.

¹⁵ F. L. Carmichael and R. Nassimbene, *Changing Aspects of Urban Relief*, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1939, p. 43.

¹⁶ *Idem*.

eight out of nine Negroes and more than four out of five whites who were receiving relief at the end of 1935 had been on relief at some time prior to that year. That Negroes had a still lower turnover and consequently stayed on the relief rolls longer than whites is further revealed by the fact that the average monthly accession and separation rates—i. e., persons getting on and off relief per 100 relief persons—during 1935 were 2.7 and 3.4 per cent, respectively, for Negroes, as against 4.9 and 6.0 per cent for whites.¹⁷ The lower turnover rates of Negroes were partly due to their greater difficulty in obtaining employment. The average monthly re-employment rate of experienced workers on relief, October-December, 1935, was 1.4 for Negroes (males 1.8 and females 0.6) as against 3.5 for whites (males 4.0 and females 1.6).¹⁸ There is some direct evidence on the point suggested by these data that re-employment less frequently was the cause of Negro than white workers leaving the relief rolls. Of all workers affected by regular closings of cases July-December, 1935, 55.3 per cent in the white group as against 43.2 per cent in the Negro group had secured employment. The difference was particularly pronounced in regard to inexperienced workers (13.8 and 1.4 per cent, respectively).¹⁹ The chances for an unemployed Negro worker without previous experience to go directly from the relief rolls to a job seem to have been limited indeed.

There are always some persons, however, who are employed but who, because of large families or low earnings, nevertheless are on relief. White males on relief in cities in May, 1934, included a somewhat larger proportion of employed workers than did Negro males. In contrast, Negro female relief recipients, 16 to 64 years of age, included a larger proportion of employed persons and also a larger proportion of women who were unemployed and looking for work than did white female recipients (Table 94). Negro women who were not working or seeking work were more likely than white females in the same situation to be out of the labor market for such compelling reasons as physical disability, feeble-mindedness, or old age (32.6 per cent of the Negro and 15.7 per cent of the white cases). The need of taking care of home and dependents was more often given as a cause for not seeking employment by white women (77.9 per cent) than by Negro women (59.0 per cent).²⁰ That the

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 58. See also pp. 53 and 56.

²⁰ Gladys L. Palmer and Katherine D. Wood, *Urban Workers on Relief*, Part I, Research Monograph IV, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1936, p. 16.

Table 94. - Employment Status of Persons 16-64 Years of Age on Relief in 79 Sample Cities, May, 1934, by Sex and Color

Employment status	Male		Female	
	Negro and other	White	Negro and other	White
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Unemployed	82.1	79.5	46.7	27.4
Employed	8.5	11.8	12.4	6.6
Not working or seeking work	9.4	8.7	40.9	66.0

Source: Gladys L. Palmer and Katherine D. Wood, *Urban Workers on Relief, Part I, Research Monograph IV*, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1936, p. 16.

earnings of employed relief recipients were inadequate to take their families off relief is indicated by the fact that the median weekly earnings of urban relief cases in May, 1934, with one or more employed workers averaged only \$4.80 in the South and \$8.40 to \$9.70 in other sections.²¹ The low southern figure was due largely to the high proportion of Negro relief cases, for Negro employed workers who were on relief made only \$3.60 on the average²² as against the \$9.20 made by white workers.²³ There was a similar race differential in practically every occupational subgroup. The highest weekly earnings were for male family heads with full-time employment, who averaged \$16.50 in the case of whites and \$11.40 in the case of Negroes and others.²⁴

In these racial differences the averages for Negroes are more strongly influenced by conditions in the South than are those for whites. To a certain extent the differences may also mirror the lesser economic opportunities in general for Negroes than for whites, although it is difficult to see how this factor could have had much influence on the private earnings of relief workers if uniform principles had been applied in the selection of cases for supplementary relief. It seems likely that part of the explanation is that supplementary relief was less available to Negroes than to whites in similar economic circumstances.²⁵

COMPOSITION OF FAMILIES ON RELIEF

During the FERA period Negro relief families tended to be somewhat smaller than white relief families. This was due in part to certain differences in the demographic and economic structure of

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

²² Includes other nonwhites.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 165-166.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

²⁵ "... if a Negro worker were employed 30 hours a week at 30 cents an hour he might be dropped from relief, whereas a white worker in some cities might continue to receive supplementary aid" (*Ibid.*, p. 83).

the general Negro and white populations. In some cases, however, it was apparently a matter of prevailing practices in relief administration. Although the data are not conclusive, there is evidence that some relief agencies were more likely to recognize the fact that the incidence of extreme poverty tends to increase with family size in their handling of white than of Negro applicants.

The Negro population on relief in October, 1933, included a smaller proportion of families with five or more members (Appendix table 59) and of families with children²⁶ than the white relief population. In 1935, also, Negro relief cases were usually somewhat smaller than white relief cases both in cities²⁷ and in the southern Cotton areas (Appendix table 60). In rural areas, at least, Negro relief cases included fewer families with children under 16 years of age²⁸ than white relief cases.

A comparison of family data from the 1930 census and from the relief census of October, 1933, indicates that the relief incidence for whites, except for a high figure for one-person families, showed a consistent tendency to increase with family size, whereas the Negro relief incidence did not show a significant trend of this type (Appendix table 59).²⁹ Although households with children were relatively less favored in the case of Negroes, there is no direct evidence in the relief statistics concerning any race differential in respect to the way relief was apportioned between families with few and families with several children.³⁰ In October, 1933, there was about the

²⁶ The percentages of normal Negro and white families on relief in October, 1933, without children, regardless of age, were as follows:

	Urban	Rural
Negro.....	33.1	26.5
White.....	19.1	17.6

(See *Unemployment Relief Census, October 1933*, Report No. 3, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-38.)

²⁷ The median size of Negro and white relief cases in 13 cities in May, 1935, was 2.6 and 2.9 persons, respectively (F. L. Carmichael and Stanley L. Payne, *The 1935 Relief Population in 13 Cities: A Cross-section*, Research bulletin, Series I, No. 23, Works Progress Administration, Washington, December 31, 1936, p. 5).

²⁸ Carle C. Zimmerman and Nathan L. Whetten, *Rural Families on Relief*, Research Monograph XVII, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, p. 134.

²⁹ This comparison must be interpreted cautiously since the relief cases did not correspond exactly to the census definition of a family. If, for example, lodgers had been considered as separate families in the census statistics, the average family size in the total population of 1930, particularly in the case of Negroes, would have been smaller than the present data indicate. It can be taken for granted, however, that there was no great difference in average size of Negro relief and nonrelief families.

³⁰ It will be recalled, however, that data from the Consumer Purchases Study in the chapter on Family Incomes (p. 81) indicate that the relief incidence more frequently tended to increase with the number of children in the case of

same amount of overrepresentation of children under 16 years of age in both relief groups in urban areas, while there was only a small excess of children on the relief rolls in rural areas.⁸¹

There appear to be several reasons for the race differential in regard to the proportion of large families on the relief rolls. In the white population, with its fewer cases proportionately of extremely low incomes, relief needs were more often directly attributable to family size than in the Negro population, which included such a large proportion of families in which the income was insufficient to meet the needs of even small family groups.

Another factor helping to account for the smaller size of Negro than white relief cases was the high proportion of broken families and nonfamily persons and groups in the Negro relief population (Appendix table 61). It is not certain, however, whether the difference in the relative number of broken families and nonfamily persons or groups really was greater than can be accounted for solely on the basis of the corresponding difference in the general population.⁸² Therefore, it is questionable whether the frequency of broken families or nonfamily groups offers even a partial explanation for the failure of Negro relief incidence to increase with family size in the same way as white relief incidence.

Age of heads, at least in rural areas, constitutes a more satisfactory explanation as families with older heads tend to be smaller than those with heads in the middle ages. Data for 145 southern counties in June, 1935, reveal that 15.9 per cent of the heads of Negro relief cases in rural areas were 65 years of age and over, whereas the corresponding proportion among white relief families was 6.2 per cent.⁸³ According to the Unemployment Relief Census of October, 1933, 5.1 per cent of all rural Negroes on relief were

whites than in the case of Negroes. The relief incidence for Negro farm families did not increase at all with increases in number of children.

⁸¹ Children under 16 years of age constituted about 39 per cent of both the Negro and the white urban relief populations of October, 1933, and 29 per cent of the total Negro and white populations of 1930 in urban areas of the South Atlantic division, and there was a similar excess of children in the urban relief population in other geographic divisions which have a large Negro population. In the rural areas of the South Atlantic division, on the other hand, children under 16 years of age constituted about 45 per cent of both the white and the Negro relief population in October, 1933, and 39 and 43 per cent, respectively, of the total population in 1930 (*Unemployment Relief Census, October 1933*, Report No. 2, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-40).

⁸² The 1930 census data are not directly comparable with the relief data in this respect.

⁸³ A. R. Mangus, *Changing Aspects of Rural Relief*, Research Monograph XIV, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, p. 68.

65 years of age and over as compared with 4.1 per cent of rural whites on relief and 3.5 per cent of all rural Negroes in 1930.⁸⁴ Thus it is evident that aged Negroes in rural areas were over-represented on the relief rolls. In contrast, rural whites had a smaller proportion of aged persons on the relief rolls in October, 1933, than in the general population of 1930 (6.2 per cent). The same racial differences were found in rural areas of each of the three southern divisions.

The age differentials may be due in part to the practice of "splitting" families in rural areas. During the FERA period some southern landlords provided the customary "furnish" of tenants⁸⁵ for only the productive members of the households and thereby forced the nonproductive members on relief. Since there are no specific data on this point, however, its significance cannot be satisfactorily evaluated.⁸⁶

Data on aged persons on relief in urban areas show a somewhat different picture. With some exceptions Negroes failed to show the kind of overrepresentation of old people on relief rolls that appeared in rural areas. The consequence was that, since there are relatively fewer old people in the total Negro population, the Negro urban relief recipients included a smaller relative number of persons 65 and over (2.8 per cent) than did the white urban relief group (3.6 per cent).⁸⁷

SIZE OF RELIEF GRANTS, BY TYPE OF RELIEF

Not only did Negro families in most rural and many urban areas of the South have greater difficulties than whites in similar economic circumstances in obtaining public assistance; also those who did get relief received smaller benefits, on the average, than white families. In many cases, however, the general level of the relief benefits for all families regardless of race appears to have been a more significant problem than the occurrence of any racial difference in size of grants. Yet those differences cannot be overlooked, for

⁸⁴ *Unemployment Relief Census, October 1933*, Report No. 2, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-43, and Report No. 3, pp. 24 and 36-38.

⁸⁵ See p. 17.

⁸⁶ "In the open country of both Cotton areas there was a larger proportion of members in Negro than in white relief households who were not considered as a part of the relief case nor counted as sharing in the distribution of relief benefits. This suggests a tendency for landlords to shift the burden of support of dependents among their tenant families to the relief agency. It is probable that white tenant families were more inclined to resist this treatment than were Negroes" (A. R. Mangus, *The Rural Negro on Relief, February 1935*, Research bulletin H-3, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Washington, October 17, 1935, p. ii).

⁸⁷ *Unemployment Relief Census, October 1933*, Report No. 2, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-43.

the greater difficulties of Negroes than whites in similar economic circumstances in obtaining any public assistance at all means that the Negro relief group tended to consist of families in greater average distress than white families. Under such conditions uniform treatment in the true sense of the word would actually have resulted in higher relief grants for Negroes than whites.

Average monthly relief benefits in southern states usually were much below the general national average. Virginia, for example, had an average of \$6.94 in July, 1933, for all cases as against \$15.51 for the country as a whole and \$30.59 for New York state (Appendix table 62). There was a general increase in benefits during the following two years which brought Virginia up to \$17.65 as against \$29.64 for the entire country and \$49.06 for New York state.⁸⁸

The low general averages for the South are due in part to the small benefits given to rural and Negro relief cases. In 1935 the monthly averages for rural relief cases in the Cotton areas ranged around \$10, whereas the corresponding averages for all rural areas were in the neighborhood of \$15 (Table 95). The Negro relief cases in the Cotton areas with only one exception (Western Cotton area in October, 1935) received from \$2 to \$6 less than the white families on relief in those areas. Negroes on both direct relief and work relief usually received somewhat smaller amounts than whites. Since there was a tendency to give work relief with its higher benefits to a smaller proportion of Negro than white relief recipients, this reduced the average size of all Negro benefits in comparison with those received by whites (Appendix table 63).

Part of the discrepancy can be explained on the ground that Negro relief cases usually were somewhat smaller than white cases. That was not always true, however, as in February, 1935, Negro rural relief cases (5.1 persons) were larger than white cases (4.2 persons) in the Western Cotton area,⁸⁹ and yet Negroes received \$2 less per month on the average. Even when Negro relief cases were smaller, it was largely due to the fact that they were selected in such a way as to reduce the average size. After all the total Negro population included a larger proportion of both small and large families than the white population, and the average Negro rural household was no smaller than the white one.

⁸⁸ Unless otherwise specified, available data on monthly relief benefits are general averages for all relief cases, regardless of whether they received full or supplementary relief or whether they were on relief for the whole month or for only part of the month.

⁸⁹ See p. 230.

Table 95. - Average Monthly General Relief Benefit per Case, February, June, and October, 1935, in Sample Counties in 9 Rural Areas and in the Eastern and Western Cotton Areas, by Color

Area and color	All relief			Work relief only			Direct relief only			Both work and direct relief		
	February	June	October	February	June	October	February	June	October	February	June	October
All nine areas	\$16	\$16	\$14	\$17	\$16	\$12	\$12	\$13	\$14	\$22	\$24	\$20
Eastern Cotton	10	12	11	12	14	13	6	7	9	13	15	17
Negro	7	8	10	10	10	10	5	5	8	10	13	t
White	12	14	12	13	16	13	7	8	10	14	16	19
Western Cotton	10	10	9	10	11	6	7	7	10	14	14	11
Negro	8	8	9	9	10	6	7	6	9	12	12	t
White	10	11	9	10	11	6	8	7	10	15	15	10

t Fewer than 50 cases.

Source: A. R. Mangus, *Changing Aspects of Rural Relief*, Research Monograph XIV, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, p. 132.

In urban areas also Negro relief grants were smaller than white grants. The previously cited urban study of 13 cities for 1935 indicates that Negro general relief grants averaged \$24.18 in May, 1935, in comparison with \$29.05 for whites. The average general relief benefit in Atlanta, Georgia, was \$32.66 for whites but only \$19.29 for Negroes. In Houston, Texas, the difference, while smaller (\$16.86 for whites and \$12.67 for Negroes), tended to be larger proportionately than the racial differences in the northern and western cities surveyed.⁴⁰

In comparing relief grants with earnings from private employment, it is found that the change from direct relief to private employment raised the income substantially for the average urban relief case in both the Negro and white groups (Table 96). There were individual differences, however; of the Negro cases securing private employment 8.8 per cent received less than before, while the corresponding figure for whites was 2.7 per cent. The loss sometimes amounted to as much as \$20 or more. For 6.5 and 2.9 per cent of the cases, respectively, the wage rates in private employment were within the same \$10 interval as the previous relief grants, while for 94.4 per cent of the whites and 84.7 per cent of the Negroes wage rates exceeded relief grants.⁴¹ Works-program earnings, while less than earnings from private employment, were approximately twice as high as relief grants for both whites and Negroes.⁴²

Such data emphasize one of the basic dilemmas in relief policies. To reconcile the demand, on the one hand, that nobody should receive more money on relief than he would earn at his usual work with the demand, on the other hand, that relief standards should be adequate and uniform is hard enough under ordinary circumstances. This conflict becomes particularly pronounced when the Negro is involved, for a large proportion of the Negro population has such a low earning power in the labor market that some Negroes must inevitably receive larger incomes when on relief than when engaged in ordinary work. The less the Negro is discriminated against as a

⁴⁰ Enid Baird and Hugh P. Brinton, *Average General Relief Benefits, 1933-1938*, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1940, p. 32.

⁴¹ F. L. Carmichael and R. Nassimbene, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

⁴² Among rural relief cases in North Carolina closed from July through November, 1935, Negro heads of households employed for the full month of December, 1935, in private industry earned an average of \$15 as compared with \$35 for whites. Works-program earnings during that month averaged \$24 for whites and \$19 for Negroes. In both types of employment average earnings were considerably higher than former relief grants (Rebecca Farnham and Irene Link, *op. cit.*, pp. 44 and 55).

Table 96. - Comparison of Median Works Program and Private-employment Wage Rates with Median Relief Grants to Same Cases during Last 30 Days on Relief of Relief Cases Closed in 13 Cities, October-December, 1935, by Color

Type of employment	Relief grants		Wage rates	
	All races a/	Negro	White	Negro
Cases leaving direct relief and securing:				
Works program employment	\$28	\$25	\$29	\$54
Private employment	32	26	33	70
				\$56
				91

a/ Includes Negro, white, and other.

Source: F. L. Carmichael and R. Nassimbene, Changing Aspects of Urban Relief, Works Progress Administration Washington, 1939, p. 86.

relief client, the higher the general relief standards become; and the greater the Negro-white wage differentials on the labor market are, the more numerous such cases become. At any rate the cases in which relief grants exceed usual earnings must be frequent among large Negro families. Otherwise the principle that public assistance should be apportioned among families of various sizes in accordance with their relative needs could not be maintained.

Chapter XIII

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

With the gradual termination of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration in the latter half of 1935, employable persons on relief were transferred to the Works Progress Administration, later called the Work Projects Administration. Designed to provide employment for the unemployed on public work projects, the program can be rapidly expanded or contracted in response to changes in general employment. The representation of Negroes on WPA over a period of time reflects not only the extent to which their need for assistance is met but also the effect of changes in the size of the total WPA load.

As the subsequent detailed information indicates, the Negro's share of the jobs on WPA during recent years has exceeded his proportion in the total population. As in many types of assistance, however, the situation has differed from one part of the country to another. It has been most favorable in the North. In various southern communities, particularly in rural areas, on the other hand, Negro unemployed workers have had less chance of receiving work relief than white unemployed workers. Such differences are the more significant in view of the fact that a higher proportion of Negro than white unemployed workers must have been in urgent need of public assistance.

PROPORTION OF NEGROES ON WPA

At the end of April, 1941, about 1,450,000 certified workers were assigned to projects financed by the Work Projects Administration. Of these 237,000, or 16 per cent, were Negroes.¹ Thus, the proportion of Negroes on WPA was higher than the proportion of nonwhites in the total population (10.2 per cent) or among all

¹ Unpublished tabulations, Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, Division of Statistics, Washington, June 27, 1941.

Table 27. - Proportion of Nonwhites in the Total Population and among All Unemployed Workers, ^a/ April, 1940 and Proportion of Negroes among WPA Workers, April 30, 1941, in States with 100,000 Negro Population or More in 1930

State	Per cent nonwhite, 1940		Negroes as per cent of all WPA workers, April 1941	State	Per cent nonwhite, 1940		Negroes as per cent of all WPA workers, April 1941
	In total population	Among unemployed workers			In total population	Among unemployed workers	
United States total	10.2	12.5	16.3				
The North							
New York	4.5	4.5	18.0	Virginia	24.8	35.3	26.6
New Jersey	5.5	10.1	23.3	West Virginia	6.2	6.4	5.2
Pennsylvania	4.8	9.4	16.8	North Carolina	28.2	36.3	30.1
Ohio	4.9	12.1	22.2	South Carolina	43.0	59.7	43.4
Indiana	3.5	9.5	11.0	Georgia	34.7	36.5	28.4
Illinois	5.0	12.8	22.7	Florida	27.0	31.6	27.3
Michigan	4.1	10.1	19.5	Kentucky	7.5	12.1	7.6
Missouri	6.5	14.4	15.6	Tennessee	17.3	23.9	11.1
The South				Alabama	34.8	34.8	30.6
				Mississippi	49.5	35.9	27.7
				Arkansas	24.8	21.4	17.8
				Louisiana	36.0	38.4	43.7
				Oklahoma	9.9	16.0	12.3
				Texas	14.5	19.3	17.3
Maryland	16.7	27.6	32.4				
District of Columbia	28.6	51.0	68.9				

^a/ Unemployed includes persons seeking work and persons employed as public emergency workers on pay rolls of federal agencies (WPA, NYA, CCC, etc.)

Sources: Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 4, and P-5, No. 8; and unpublished tabulations, Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, Division of Statistics. Washington, June 27, 1941.

unemployed workers 14 years of age and over (12.5 per cent), according to the 1940 census (Table 97). This difference was particularly pronounced in the northern states, while the border states and the southern states showed a much less consistent picture. In the District of Columbia more than two-thirds of the WPA workers were Negroes, but only half of all unemployed workers and only one-fourth to one-third of the total population were nonwhites. In Missouri, Maryland, South Carolina, and Louisiana the proportions of Negroes on WPA in 1941 were slightly higher than the percentages of nonwhites among all unemployed workers in 1940. In the majority of the southern and border states, on the other hand, the chances of an unemployed Negro being assigned to WPA were smaller than those of a white unemployed worker. Nevertheless, in most southern states Negroes had a somewhat larger share of the WPA jobs in 1941 than they had had during 1937-40 because the reduction in the WPA rolls in 1940-41 affected whites to a greater extent than Negroes (Table 98). There has been no steady trend toward improvement in the relative position of Negroes, however, as the large-scale curtailment of the works program which occurred between February, 1939, and May, 1940, cost southern Negroes 34 per cent and southern whites 25 per cent of their work-relief jobs.² Furthermore, the development of the program varied from state to state. In Tennessee the proportion Negroes constituted of all WPA workers declined from 18 per cent in September, 1937, to 11 per cent in April, 1941. In South Carolina, in contrast, the proportion Negroes constituted of all WPA workers actually increased from 28 per cent to 43 per cent during the same period.

A comparison between counties having cities with 10,000 population or more in 1930 and other counties (Appendix table 64) indicates that it is particularly in the rural areas of the South that Negroes have been represented in relatively small proportions on the WPA rolls. In both county groups there were proportionately fewer Negroes employed on WPA in 1940 than there were Negroes on relief in 1935; but the difference in rural counties was particularly noteworthy, since already during the FERA period Negroes in those counties were provided for less adequately than whites. In large southern cities, on the other hand, Negroes have

² Special tabulations by the Work Projects Administration show that the number of Negro WPA workers in 13 southern states and the District of Columbia was 167,134 in February, 1939, and 111,089 in May, 1940. (These figures include a small number of noncertified workers.) The corresponding figures for whites were 522,114 and 389,786, respectively.

Table 98. - Employment of Negroes on WPA Projects in Selected Southern States, September, 1937-April, 1941

State	September 25, 1937		March 16, 1938		September 17, 1938		May 1, 1940		April 30, 1941	
	Number	Per cent of state total	Number	Per cent of state total	Number	Per cent of state total	Number	Per cent of state total	Number	Per cent of state total
Total - 11 states -	53,452	23.3	91,427	24.0	137,305	24.3	100,234	22.9	96,679	26.1
Virginia -	4,241	25.9	6,019	27.0	7,103	26.3	5,872	24.7	5,024	26.6
North Carolina -	4,165	22.1	7,476	24.6	10,468	22.0	11,289	27.4	9,498	30.1
South Carolina -	4,231	27.9	9,912	33.9	15,673	35.4	12,395	33.8	11,575	43.4
Georgia -	5,841	26.6	11,479	31.3	20,276	35.0	10,572	26.8	9,088	28.4
Florida -	5,101	22.2	6,583	21.9	11,875	23.3	6,412	18.7	7,804	27.3
Tennessee -	3,266	17.5	4,701	15.5	6,457	14.1	5,069	13.2	3,340	11.1
Alabama -	5,572	30.5	9,567	27.4	15,786	26.6	11,478	27.2	10,275	30.6
Mississippi -	2,730	17.2	5,419	18.5	7,908	19.7	7,715	24.4	8,401	27.7
Arkansas -	2,639	14.7	4,745	14.9	7,040	14.8	5,164	15.1	5,573	17.6
Louisiana -	8,906	40.1	12,853	41.4	19,174	39.2	10,831	34.4	12,332	43.7
Texas -	6,790	15.6	12,673	17.1	15,545	17.1	13,447	15.9	13,779	17.3

Source: Unpublished tabulations, Federal Security Agency, Work Projects Administration, Division of Statistics, Washington, June 27, 1941.

usually been overrepresented on work relief, as the following examples suggest.

State	Per cent nonwhite in total population, 1940	Negroes as per cent of all WPA workers, April 30, 1941
Maryland.....	16.7	32.4
Baltimore.....	19.4	53.5
Balance of state.....	14.3	18.0
Virginia.....	24.8	26.6
Richmond.....	31.7	40.7
Norfolk.....	31.7	67.9
Balance of state.....	23.8	20.1
Louisiana.....	36.0	43.7
New Orleans.....	30.2	56.8
Balance of state.....	37.6	33.3

Sources: *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940*, Preliminary releases, Series P-5, Nos. 8 and 10; and unpublished tabulations, Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, Division of Statistics, Washington, June 27, 1941.

An exact comparison with the proportion of nonwhites in the population cannot be made for other cities than those shown above, as the WPA data in most cases cover the entire county and 1940 census information on the nonwhite population by counties is not yet available. A rough comparison, however, suggests that Negroes in 5 of the 22 southern cities with 100,000 population or more in 1940—namely, Miami and Tampa, Florida; Chattanooga, Nashville, and Memphis, Tennessee—had proportionately fewer representatives on WPA than in the total population and that they had about equal representation with whites in 3 cities; namely, Birmingham, Alabama, Knoxville, Tennessee, and San Antonio, Texas. Thus Negroes were overrepresented on WPA as of April 30, 1941, in 14 of 22 southern and border-state cities with 100,000 or more population. In over half of the large southern cities Negroes constituted one-third or more of all WPA workers.³

The representation of Negroes on WPA may also be compared with the proportions they constituted of heads of families on relief. In the South, Negroes accounted for approximately the same pro-

³ Birmingham, Ala.; Washington, D. C.; Atlanta, Ga.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Louisville, Ky.; New Orleans, La.; Baltimore, Md.; Charlotte, N. C.; Memphis, Tenn.; Dallas, Tex.; and Norfolk and Richmond, Va. (Unpublished tabulations, Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, Division of Statistics, Washington, June 27, 1941).

Table 99. - Proportion of Negroes among Heads of All Families, 1930, among Economic Heads of Families on Relief, March, 1935, and among Workers on WPA, February, 1935, by Region and Sex

Region	Per cent of Negroes							
	Both sexes				Male			
	Heads of all families, 1930	Heads of families on relief, 1935	WPA workers, 1935	Heads of all families, 1930	Heads of families on relief, 1935	WPA workers, 1935	Heads of all families, 1930	Heads of families on relief, 1935
United States total ---	9.4	14.5	14.2	8.7	12.5	14.0	14.3	27.6
13 southern states and the District of Columbia ---	26.8	28.7	24.2	24.6	25.8	26.2	41.7	41.4
All other states ---	3.2	10.1	10.8	3.0	8.7	10.2	4.7	20.9
								15.9
								15.7

Sources: Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. VI, State table 13; Philip M. Hauser, Workers on Relief in the United States in March, 1935, Vol. I, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, p. 102; and unpublished tabulations, Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, Division of Statistics, Washington, June 27, 1941.

portion of all male workers on WPA in 1939 that they did of all male heads of families on relief in 1935 (Table 99). Outside the South, where Negroes already had a somewhat higher representation on relief in 1935 than whites, Negroes constituted a larger proportion of male workers on WPA in 1939 than they had of male heads of families on relief.

The most striking change during the four-year period occurred with regard to females. Negroes everywhere accounted for a smaller proportion of female workers on WPA in 1939 than they had of all female heads of families on relief in 1935. In the South, where 42 per cent of all female heads of families in 1930 and 41 per cent of such heads on relief in 1935 were Negroes, they accounted for only 16 per cent of all women on WPA in 1939. Outside the South, Negro women were less well represented on WPA in 1939 than they had been on relief in 1935; but they still constituted 16 per cent of all female workers on WPA as compared with 5 per cent of all female heads of households in 1930. Thus approximately the same proportion of women workers on WPA (16 per cent) in both the South and the remainder of the states were Negroes.

Data from the 1937 Unemployment Census on emergency workers and from the 1940 census (Tables 100 and 101), although they include not only WPA workers but also CCC, NYA, and related workers, provide supplementary evidence with regard to differences in representation on work programs. Women generally, white as well as Negro, are represented on work relief to a lesser extent than men (Table 100). This is largely due to the policy of allowing only one person per family, usually the chief breadwinner, to receive this kind of assistance. White and colored women who were unemployed in 1940 had about the same possibilities of obtaining work relief in urban areas, but in rural areas the jobless colored females had much less chance of getting this kind of assistance (Table 101). This difference was largely due to the regulations concerning local sponsorship of projects. While Negro and white males may work on the same outdoor projects in the South, women's projects, which are carried on indoors, are entirely segregated. Therefore, sponsorship of work projects on which Negro women can be employed is frequently difficult to obtain as most sponsoring agencies in the South have little interest in creating work-relief jobs for Negro women. At the same time public opinion is opposed to WPA employment for Negro women which competes with domestic service. It is evident that the situation works considerable hardship on

Table 100. - Emergency Workers as Per Cent of All Unemployed Workers According to the Unemployment Check Census of 1937 and the 1940 Census, by Sex and Color

Sex	Unemployment census, 1937			Population census, 1940		
	Total	Colored	White	Total	Nonwhite	White
Male - - - - -	21.6	25.7	21.0	33.6	39.1	33.0
Female - - -	10.4	7.9	10.9	25.5	21.8	26.1

Sources: Calvert L. Dedrick and Morris H. Hansen, Final Report on Total and Partial Unemployment, 1937, Vol. IV, The Enumerative Check Census, Census of Partial Employment, Unemployment, and Occupations, Washington, 1938, p.38; and Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 4.

Percentages for 1937 were computed on the basis of the sum of the totally unemployed and those on emergency work. The basis for the 1940 figures was the sum of those seeking work and those on public emergency work. The 1940 data are too low, however, because of the misclassification of many public emergency workers. Whereas the workers on emergency relief according to the census constituted 2,380,062 persons or 32 per cent of all unemployed workers, the reports from the various relief agencies show that the correct total, excluding NYA student aid cases, was 2,906,196 (Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 5).

Negro women, since they more often than white women are the main supporters of their families.

In fact, all the available data suggest that Negro heads of families who are women have a particularly disadvantaged position. Moreover, the data on WPA in conjunction with those on aid to dependent children and general relief⁴ indicate that the relative position of the Negro female family head on public assistance programs has become less advantageous since the Federal Emergency Relief Administration period.

WAGE RATES AND OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION ON WPA

The wage policies in work relief have undergone frequent changes. This is quite understandable in view of the several, partly conflicting, requirements of a wage system in work relief. It should provide the workers and their families with the necessities of life. Even if these be defined according to a rather low minimum standard, however, strict adherence to this principle would result in many workers with large families receiving more than they could earn in private employment. Because of this wages on work relief have been set with more or less consideration of the relation of the wage level to the private labor market. This means among other things that wages have been differentiated according to the skill and ability

⁴ See pp. 280 and 287.

Table 101.-Per Cent Colored among Persons Seeking Work and among Emergency Workers, ^{a/} by Sex and Residence, 1940

Sex	Total		Rural - farm		Rural - nonfarm		Urban
	Persons seeking work	Emergency workers	Persons seeking work	Emergency workers	Persons seeking work	Emergency workers	Persons seeking work
Both sexes	12.1	13.5	9.4	7.4	9.4	8.3	13.2
Male	10.6	13.4	7.9	7.5	8.5	8.7	11.7
Female	16.6	13.6	15.5	6.5	13.5	6.0	17.3
							17.8
							17.9
							17.2

^{a/} Emergency workers on WPA, NYA, CCC, etc. are underenumerated. Only in so far as the relative size of this error is significantly different for colored and white can it have any appreciable effect upon the proportion of colored among persons on emergency work.

Source: Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 4.

of the workers. Such an approach only minimizes the problem, however. The range of wages in the labor market is so great and reaches so far below any minimum cost of living that any relief wage system would have to be higher than some of the rates in private employment.

A number of compromises between various conflicting requirements have been tried. From 1936 through June 1939 wages were set in accordance with local wage rates. The number of hours worked per month was adjusted for workers in such a way that the monthly earnings amounted to certain stipulated security wages, which were differentiated by region, skill, and class of work.⁵ As a result some workers were allowed to work only a few hours per month, which complicated the administration of the projects. Since July 1, 1939, all workers on WPA have been employed 130 hours per month at monthly security wages which vary from \$31.20 for the class "Unskilled B" in counties where the largest municipality has less than 5,000 population, located in Region III (13 southern states), to \$94.90 for the highest class of relief workers in large cities of Region I (North and Middle West). The following examples⁶ give a somewhat more comprehensive picture of the wage system:⁷

*Region and size
of largest
municipality
in county*

*Unskilled
"B"*

*Unskilled
"A"*

*Inter-
mediate*

Skilled

*Professional
and technical*

Region I (North and Middle West)

100,000 and over.....	\$52.00	\$57.20	\$68.90	\$89.70	\$94.90
Under 5,000.....	39.00	42.90	52.00	67.60	68.90

Region III (South)

100,000 and over.....	46.80	50.70	61.10	79.30	81.90
Under 5,000.....	31.20	35.10	42.90	54.60	55.90

Even the low monthly wages, particularly in the South, are considerably higher than the grants most relief cases are likely to get under any other form of assistance. Southern Negroes especially

⁵ Arthur E. Burns and Edward A. Williams, *A Survey of Relief and Security Programs*, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, p. 48.

⁶ See Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, *Report on Progress of the WPA Program, June 30, 1940*, Washington, p. 85.

⁷ Effective November 1, 1941, there was a raise in monthly earnings of \$3.90 for professional and technical workers and \$5.20 for all other groups. This was not designed to change the basic earnings schedule but merely to provide for an additional payment of wages during the present emergency to assist in meeting the increased cost of living (Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, *General Order No. 4, Amendment No. 1, October 15, 1941*, Washington).

have little or no chance of obtaining comparable assistance from other relief sources. It is furthermore evident that work-relief earnings may be equal to or higher than wages on the private labor market. Many WPA workers undoubtedly are higher up the economic ladder than many privately employed workers. This is especially true in the South and most of all with regard to Negroes in the rural South. This is easily understood when one considers the low earnings of agricultural families.⁸ These circumstances must make many relief agencies in the South rather reluctant to refer Negroes to WPA.

This is not a criticism of the wage policies of the WPA. As has been previously explained, it is impossible to devise any wage system that would be satisfactory in every respect; and the conflict between the various requirements of the wage system must be particularly acute in the case of Negroes. There is no way out of the dilemma: either Negroes must be discriminated against in the allocation of WPA jobs or it must be accepted that a great number of Negro workers on WPA will earn more than they would in private employment.⁹ No other alternative is feasible unless all WPA wages are scaled down to such a low level that they represent an entirely inadequate amount of relief.

Indeed, even though in all probability Negroes more often than whites make better wages on WPA than in private employment, Negroes nevertheless receive lower work-relief earnings on the average. While the wages are the same for workers in the same counties who are considered to have equal skills, Negroes more often than whites live in counties in which the wages are lower than the maximum, and they are more often classified as unskilled laborers. This last difference is, of course, largely due to the fact that they have had less training than whites as skilled, semiskilled, or professional workers. There is a general complaint among Negroes, however, that the difference goes even farther than that—in other words, that Negro semiskilled, skilled, clerical, and professional workers have greater difficulties than corresponding groups of white workers in getting their proper rating when working on WPA.

It is extremely difficult to find conclusive evidence to substantiate such charges. A comparison between the family heads among all workers on relief in March, 1935, and the WPA workers in May,

⁸ See pp. 62-70.

⁹ To help meet the problems involved, WPA projects in many areas have been closed down wholly or partially in order to release workers for the harvesting of crops.

Table 102. - Proportion of Economic Heads of Families on Relief, March, 1935, Whose Usual Occupation Was Other than Unskilled a/ and of WPA Workers, May, 1940, Assigned to Other than Unskilled Occupations, by Color, and Proportion of Negroes among These Same Groups by Class of Usual Occupation March, 1935, and by Wage Class, May, 1940, for Selected Southern States

State	Per cent of workers in other than unskilled occupations				Negroes as a per cent of specified group			
	Negro		White		Unskilled workers		All others	
	Heads of families on relief, 1935	WPA workers, 1940	Heads of families on relief, 1935	WPA workers, 1940	Heads of families on relief, 1935	WPA workers, 1940	Heads of families on relief, 1935	WPA workers, 1940
District of Columbia	26.1	21.7	67.7	73.9	85.9	86.5	50.8	38.6
Virginia	25.7	9.3	43.3	27.2	45.9	30.0	27.7	10.5
North Carolina	19.0	9.4	42.9	28.8	49.3	33.8	23.3	11.6
South Carolina	11.3	7.4	44.3	42.2	60.1	46.3	19.4	8.6
Georgia	17.8	8.6	43.6	36.8	49.2	35.8	21.3	8.3
Florida	19.6	8.5	54.9	37.1	49.1	26.0	16.2	5.3
Kentucky	23.0	13.5	28.1	26.3	9.5	9.1	8.5	4.2
Tennessee	25.7	7.0	39.5	22.5	23.2	15.9	13.8	4.7
Alabama	25.0	7.0	62.6	32.7	63.0	35.2	28.4	7.8
Mississippi	11.0	5.7	35.4	36.5	39.5	33.4	12.8	5.1
Arkansas	19.5	5.4	26.9	31.5	22.6	20.5	16.1	3.1
Louisiana	34.9	10.3	72.2	32.1	74.1	42.3	37.1	15.1
Oklahoma	10.0	14.1	22.3	37.6	16.1	14.2	6.9	4.3
Texas	10.1	10.0	31.7	27.1	30.9	19.8	9.7	6.9

a/ Inexperienced persons were classified with the unskilled.

Sources: Philip Hauser, Workers on Relief in the United States in March, 1935, Vol. I, Part III, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, Table 13; and unpublished tabulations, Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration, Division of Statistics, Washington, June 27, 1941.

1940, however, seems to provide somewhat better than circumstantial evidence (Table 102). True, the data do not refer to the same persons; and the classification by usual occupation of relief workers may have changed to some extent during the period 1935-40. There is no particular reason, on the other hand, to believe that such a change would be more pronounced for Negroes than for whites. The figures show that the proportion of Negro WPA workers in 1940 who had been assigned to other than unskilled occupations was much lower than the 1935 percentage of Negro family heads on relief whose usual occupations were semiskilled, skilled, clerical, or professional. White workers, too, showed a similar difference; but it was usually less pronounced, and there were several exceptions to the rule. Five of the 14 southern states had a higher percentage of white WPA workers assigned to other than unskilled jobs than the proportion such workers constituted of heads of white relief families in 1935. Furthermore, the proportion of Negroes among other than unskilled WPA workers in the southern states invariably was lower than the proportion of heads of relief families whose usual occupations were above the unskilled level. Thus, although the evidence is rather indirect, it suggests that in most of the southern states it actually is more difficult for Negro semi-skilled, skilled, clerical, and professional workers to become assigned in similar capacities on WPA than it is for white workers of corresponding competence.

TYPE OF PROJECT

Another important set of conditions under which Negroes work on WPA involves the type of project. According to the administrative classification of WPA projects which divides them into "Operations" and "Professional and Service Projects," Negroes in the South are poorly represented in the latter group.

Since "Operations" projects (including construction, repairs, and conservation work) are reserved almost exclusively for men, while "Professional and Service Projects" are usually open to both men and women, the reasons Negro women are discriminated against more than Negro men are clarified. It is on the sewing projects that Negroes are most poorly represented, and these projects have been numerically quite important (Table 103). They are staffed almost entirely by women and require relatively large sponsors' contributions per WPA worker. Obviously much of the underrepresentation of Negro women on WPA can be traced directly to the sewing projects.

Table 103. - Total and Negro Employment on WPA Projects in Selected Southern States, ^{a/} by Type of Project, May 1, 1940

Type of project	Total employed	Negroes employed	
		Number	As per cent of total employed
Total	437,613	100,234	22.9
Division of Operations	316,854	64,439	26.6
Highways, roads, and streets	213,874	51,963	24.3
Public buildings	36,875	6,572	23.2
Recreational facilities	11,406	4,172	36.6
Publicly owned or operated utilities	23,042	10,115	43.9
Airports and airways	3,697	1,127	30.5
Conservation	6,495	2,321	35.7
Sanitation	17,717	5,005	28.2
All other	3,748	1,164	31.1
Division of Professional and Service Projects	117,966	15,457	13.1
Education	7,273	2,620	36.0
Recreation	5,765	1,007	17.5
Sewing	40,857	3,039	7.4
All other, including federal nationwide	64,071	6,791	13.7
Supply Fund	2,793	338	12.1

^{a/} Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

Source: Unpublished tabulations, Work Projects Administration, Division of Research and Statistics, Washington.

The proportion of Negroes in supervisory, expert, and administrative jobs on WPA is negligible. In 14 southern states there were only 11 Negro supervisors in May, 1940, as compared with 10,333 white supervisors. The type of work of Negroes in the better WPA jobs is described in the following excerpt from a WPA circular:

According to the September, 1938, report of the WPA Specialist in Education among Negroes, some 4,100 Negro teachers were employed in the Education Program of the Administration in thirty-six states and the District of Columbia. . . . Six hundred teachers, dieticians, cooks, helpers, and custodial workers were employed in the nursery school program of the WPA up to and during September, 1938.

Total figures for this same period show that 208 Negro educational and recreational supervisors and fifty-one instructional supervisors were employed by the WPA.

The office of the Editor of Negro Affairs, of the Federal Writers' Project, reports 196 as the peak employment figure for Negro writers and research specialists employed by the WPA in preparing books published by this Administration in the American Guide Series.¹⁰

¹⁰ A. E. Smith and James A. Atkins, *The Works Progress Administration and the American Negro*, Mimeograph No. 13983, Works Progress Administration, Washington, p. 2.

Negro participation in the federal administration of the WPA has also been slight. In September, 1938, there were 91 Negroes employed in the Washington headquarters of the Works Progress Administration, including an Administrative Assistant, a Consultant, a Junior Race Relations Officer, a Special Assistant in the Information Service, secretarial and clerical aides, clerks in the mailing division, drivers, elevator operators, and laborers.

Chapter XIV

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FOR YOUTH

The problems of keeping young people in school and of getting them jobs after they believe they have had enough schooling are not new in the United States. Efforts to meet these problems prior to 1930 took the form of private charity, scholarships, special vocational courses, vocational guidance by the schools, and other programs, but the total amount of money spent was small compared with that spent for similar purposes after the onset of the depression of the 1930's. During the depression youth were more severely affected by unemployment than most other age groups. Not only were inexperienced youth unable to find jobs in an economy which was no longer expanding but also parents were less able to support their offspring; college budgets were curtailed, diminishing the number of odd jobs and scholarships available; and even youth with training and experience had difficulties in finding employment.

To help meet the problems of youth the federal government initiated the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1933 and the National Youth Administration in 1935. The relation of these two organizations to Negro youth until the discontinuance of the CCC and the curtailment of the NYA as of July 1, 1942, is the primary concern of this section.

THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The Civilian Conservation Corps was created "for the purpose of relieving the acute condition of widespread distress and unemployment . . . and in order to provide for the restoration of the country's depleted natural resources and the advancement of an orderly program of useful public works."¹ The Act of June 28, 1937, continuing the Civilian Conservation Corps, provided for general

¹ Public, No. 5, 73d Congress.

education and vocational training.² Thus the original objectives of the Corps as a relief and job-giving agency for young men were supplemented by emphasis on work training. Later the place of the Corps in helping meet national defense needs was stressed although the actual types of work performed were not changed materially.

That Negro youth should not be discriminated against was implied in the provisions for eligibility for enrollment in the Corps as the law stated that "the Director may exclude from enrollment such classes of persons as he may consider detrimental to the well-being or welfare of the Corps, except that no person shall be excluded on account of race, color, or creed."³ In evaluating the program as it applied to Negro youth, the first consideration is the extent to which they benefited from it. During the seven years from its inception in April, 1933, to June, 1940, 300,000 colored youth, in round numbers, were enrolled on the program.⁴ When the Corps was at its peak strength in August, 1935, about 265 colored camps were in operation, or one out of every 10 camps.⁵ In June, 1940, there were approximately 30,000 colored enrollees in colored and mixed CCC camps. Of the 151 colored camps in operation at that time, 83 were located in 12 southern states and the remaining 68 in eastern and northern states. In addition, 59 camps in New England and 12 elsewhere each had one or more Negro enrollees.⁶ The figures for June, 1940, represented about 10 per cent of the CCC enrollees and 10 per cent of the camps, thus corresponding approximately to the proportion of Negroes in the total population.

In the early days of the CCC program Negro youth were greatly underrepresented on the program in terms of their relative proportion among all unmarried youth⁷ (Tables 104 and 105). The reasons for this were various. The selections were made by the welfare agencies of the state and the local communities, which were instructed to choose the best-qualified young men on the basis of uniform national standards. During the year ending June 30, 1939,

² Public, No. 163, 75th Congress.

³ *Ibid.*, Sec. 8.

⁴ Edgar G. Brown, *What the Civilian Conservation Corps Is Doing for Colored Youth*, Federal Security Agency, Civilian Conservation Corps, Washington, June, 1940, p. i.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁶ *The Civilian Conservation Corps*, Recommendations of the American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, Washington, December, 1940, p. 18.

⁷ Enrollment of juniors in the CCC was limited to physically fit, unmarried young men who were unemployed and in need of work.

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Table 104.—Proportion of Negroes among Junior Enrollees in the Civilian Conservation Corps, January 31, 1934–February, 1941

Date	Negro enrollment	Total enrollment	Per cent Negro
January 31, 1934	15,425	289,184	5.3
January 31, 1935	21,135	346,245	6.1
January 31, 1936	40,956	413,011	9.9
January 31, 1937	31,767	351,475	9.0
June 30, 1937	31,518	350,350	9.0
January 31, 1938	30,446	276,953	11.0
May 31, 1939	25,412	256,091	9.9
February 1941			10.9

Sources: Howard W. Oxley, Survey of Educational Program in Negro C.C.C. Camps, U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Washington, June 30, 1938, p. 1; Annual Reports of the Director of Emergency Conservation Work and of the Civilian Conservation Corps, 1934 to 1938; and unpublished data from the Office of the Director of CCC Camp Education.

more than 5,000 local agents certified enrollees.⁸ While it may be desirable to operate through already established agencies, it does give an opportunity for wide variation in selection and for local prejudices to play a part. The fact that there was a surplus of applicants much of the time made it easy for local selection agents to follow any biases. During the year ending June 30, 1939, 3½ men, on the average, applied for each junior vacancy.⁹

Referring to Greene and Macon counties in Georgia, which he has studied intensively, Raper stated in 1936:

The benefits of the Civilian Conservation Corps in these counties have been limited almost wholly to the whites. When the first recruits were secured the local agents in these counties assumed that only whites should make application; no word was sent from state or federal offices to correct their orthodox "Solid South" assumption, until after the first quota had been filled. Thirty white boys went from Macon, a slightly smaller number from Greene. Months later, two Negro boys went from Macon and a couple from Greene—but in these two Black Belt counties the CCC has remained a white institution, with no more coloring than

⁸ *Annual Report of the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1939*, Washington, p. 9.

⁹ *Annual Report of the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1939*, Washington, p. 1.

Table 105.- Proportion of Negroes among Junior Enrollees in the Civilian Conservation Corps, May 31, 1939, and in the Single Male Population 15-24 Years of Age, 1930, by Residence and Area

Item	United States	Fourth Corps area ^{a/}	All other areas
<u>Total</u>			
Total CCC enrollees..	256,091	41,588	214,503
Negro enrollees			
Number	25,412	8,920	16,492
Per cent	9.9	21.4	7.7
Per cent Negroes constitute of all single males 15-24 years of age	9.3	33.7	4.8
<u>Rural-farm</u>			
Total CCC enrollees..	78,751	24,291	54,460
Negro enrollees			
Number	6,790	3,569	3,221
Per cent	8.6	14.7	5.9
Per cent Negroes constitute of all single males 15-24 years of age	14.6	-	-
<u>Rural-nonfarm</u>			
Total CCC enrollees..	58,648	9,228	49,420
Negro enrollees			
Number	5,545	2,300	3,245
Per cent	9.5	24.9	6.6
Per cent Negroes constitute of all single males 15-24 years of age	9.2	-	-
<u>Urban</u>			
Total CCC enrollees..	118,692	8,069	110,623
Negro enrollees			
Number	13,077	3,051	10,026
Per cent	11.0	37.8	9.1
Per cent Negroes constitute of all single males 15-24 years of age	6.5	-	-

^{a/} Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Sources: Unpublished data from Office of the Director of CCC Camp Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington; and Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population, Vol. II, Chap. 11.

landownership which tolerates the possession of one acre in twenty by Negroes.¹⁰

While it is impossible to generalize from these two counties, they do indicate one type of reaction to the program.

In addition, Negro youth had to learn that such a service as the CCC was available. Charles S. Johnson has observed that the first quotas were nearly completed before the Negro was aware of the new opportunity.¹¹ Furthermore, Negro youth are largely rural-farm youth and the Civilian Conservation Corps apparently reached more rural-nonfarm youth proportionately than farm youth.¹² Therefore, this general limitation applied to Negro youth in addition to any racial variations in enrollment.

In 1930, 9 per cent of the single male population of the United States, 15-24 years of age, consisted of Negro youth.¹³ On this basis it appears that sometime prior to January, 1936, the Negro enrollment in the CCC had come up to the proportion of Negroes in the same age group in the total population (Table 104). In other words, Negroes had equal representation on the program on a population basis; but they were underrepresented from the viewpoint of relative needs.¹⁴ Although the eligibility requirement that youth must come from families with some member eligible for relief was modified to open the Corps to other youth as early as June, 1936, the enrollment continued to come largely from relief and low-income families.¹⁵

¹⁰ Arthur F. Raper, *Preface to Peasantry*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1936, p. 263.

¹¹ Charles S. Johnson, "Incidence upon the Negroes," *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XL, May, 1935, p. 742.

¹² In January, 1937, there were 68,716 rural-farm enrollees as compared with 122,778 rural-nonfarm enrollees (*Annual Report of the Director of Emergency Conservation Work, Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1937*, Washington, p. 35).

¹³ The minimum age for CCC junior enrollment was set at 17 years. Three-fifths of all youth enrolled in 1939-40 were 17 or 18 years of age. Less than 2 per cent were 23 years of age and over.

¹⁴ See Chapter V.

¹⁵ Until July, 1940, junior enrollees in the CCC were limited to young men whose families were on relief, eligible for relief, or whose incomes were below the normal standards of living in the community. On June 24, 1940, James J. McEntee, Director of the CCC, announced a change in eligibility standards to go into effect the following month. "The revised regulations will make it possible to enroll boys from families in moderate circumstances if the boy is in need of employment and training and his family is unable to give him needed education, job training and vocational training opportunities. Young men will not be eligible if their families are in such financial circumstances that they can provide such training.

"Priority has always been given to young men in the order of need. The same policy will be followed in the July enrollment." (See *New York Herald Tribune*, June 25, 1940, p. 36.)

Still more recently, eligibility for enrollment in the CCC was extended to "young men attending college whose families are in the moderate income group" (Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, Press release of August 4, 1940).

While recognizing the limitations of the data, some rough comparisons between CCC enrollments in the South and the rest of the country are possible. The Fourth Corps area, which includes eight southern states,¹⁶ accounted for slightly more than one-third of all Negro junior enrollees on May 31, 1939 (Table 105). It included 53 per cent of the Negro rural-farm enrollees and 41 per cent of the rural-nonfarm enrollees but only 23 per cent of the urban enrollees.

Comparing the proportions of Negroes among all junior enrollees on May 31, 1939, with their proportions among single males 15-24 years of age in 1930, it is clear that on a population basis Negroes were underrepresented in the CCC in the Fourth Corps area but overrepresented in all other areas combined, which included the remaining southern states.¹⁷ In the Fourth Corps area one-third of all single males 15-24 years of age in 1930 but only slightly more than one-fifth of all CCC enrollees on May 31, 1939, were Negroes.

Negro youth constituted a smaller proportion of all junior enrollees on May 31, 1939, from rural-farm areas than they did of the single male population 15-24 years of age in rural-farm areas in 1930 (Table 105). In contrast Negro youth accounted for about the same proportion of rural-nonfarm enrollees that they did of the total rural-nonfarm population. In urban areas the proportion of Negro youth in the Civilian Conservation Corps was much greater than their proportion in the urban male population 15-24 years of age.

Enrollment at any one time does not tell the entire story, as the number of youth who benefited from the CCC was also determined by the turnover: some youth remained in the Corps for only six months, while others remained for the maximum of two years. That Negroes stayed in the camps, on the average, for significantly longer periods than whites is shown by a special survey made in January, 1937:

Whereas the median period of enrollment was 8.9, 9.9, and 9.6 months, respectively, for white enrollees classified according to place of origin as rural, small city, and large city, the corresponding percentages

¹⁶ Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

¹⁷ Data on the percentage of Negroes in the single male population in 1940 are not yet available, but a rough indication of changes during the decade is afforded by the percentage of all males, both married and unmarried, in the Fourth Corps area, 14-24 years of age, who were nonwhite. From 1930 to 1940 the proportion nonwhite decreased from 36 per cent to 33 per cent (*Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940*, Preliminary releases, Series P-5a, Nos. 14, 15, and 16). This decrease, resulting from differential migration and other factors, indicates that the underrepresentation of Negro youth in the South in the Civilian Conservation Corps was slightly less marked than comparisons with 1930 data indicate.

for Negro enrollees were 16.2, 15.8, and 11.5 months. The holding power of the Corps for Negro youth, most of whom come from the rural South, may be indicative of the fact that opportunities for Negroes in their home communities were exceedingly restricted and that in many cases subsistence was not available at home. As a result many Negroes re-enrolled two or more times.¹⁸

Because of the smaller turnover of Negroes in the CCC, the percentage of Negroes among all those aided by the program from its inception in 1933 was less than the percentages of Negroes among those in the Corps at given times indicate.

Another aspect of the representation of Negroes in the Civilian Conservation Corps is the extent to which they shared in the administration of the program. Criticism was leveled at the CCC in this connection as exemplified by editorial comment in *The Crisis*.

The vast program for youth, the CCC and the NYA, has included our young people, but in the CCC a justifiable complaint has been that Negro instructors, advisers, and reserve army officers were not appointed in any but the tiniest proportion.¹⁹

A Civilian Conservation Corps memorandum to the press as of January 13, 1941, summarized the extent to which Negro personnel was used.

Negro reserve officers who are in inactive status and officers of the active reserve who fail to qualify for military duty, may be considered for vacancies in the officer personnel of CCC camps. . . . Negro educational advisers who have been on duty with the CCC and colored enrollees who have demonstrated their fitness will also be eligible for appointment as subalterns.

At present there are two CCC companies, one in the Second Corps Area and one in the Third Corps Area, officered and commanded entirely by colored personnel. There is a single subaltern serving in the Fifth Corps Area and one in the Eighth Corps Area. Negro enrollees constitute about ten per cent of the CCC. In 150 camps all of the enrollees are colored. Some 70 other camps have one or more colored enrollees.

A colored educational adviser is on duty at each of the 150 colored CCC camps. . . . In addition to these educational advisers, colored

¹⁸ Bruce L. Melvin and Elna N. Smith, *Rural Youth: Their Situation and Prospects*, Research Monograph XV, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, pp. 103-104. This lower turnover rate among Negroes was also pointed out by CCC officials in Jackson, Miss., during the course of an interview.

¹⁹ Vol. 47, November, 1940, p. 343. There have been individual instances in which white officers have not made satisfactory adjustments in dealing with Negro enrollees. In general, however, Negro enrollees have reported fair and honorable treatment. (See Helen M. Walker, *The CCC through the Eyes of 272 Boys*, Western Reserve University Press, Cleveland, Ohio, 1938, pp. 51-52.)

doctors and chaplains have been assigned to CCC duty during the past five years.²⁰

After a careful analysis of the policy of the Corps in generally excluding Negroes from supervisory and administrative positions, other than that of educational adviser in Negro camps, the American Youth Commission stated its belief that the CCC should increase the use of Negro supervisory and administrative personnel for Negro camps.²¹

THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

The National Youth Administration has been generally credited with providing for proportionate representation of Negro young people on its program.²² In January, 1940, Negro youth accounted for approximately 11 per cent of the total employment on NYA programs, the same percentage which they constituted of all young men and young women 16-24 years of age in 1930. A slightly larger proportion of the youth employed on the out-of-school work program (12.9 per cent) than on the student work program (9.7 per cent) consisted of Negroes (Table 106). By March, 1941, the representation of Negroes on each program was slightly higher. At that time they accounted for 13.3 per cent of the total employed on the out-of-school work program and 10.4 per cent of those employed on the student work program.²³

The number employed at any one time has been much lower than the total benefited during the year.²⁴ Thus, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, a total of 136,000 Negro youth were employed. Of these 64,000 were employed on the student work program

²⁰ Federal Security Agency, Civilian Conservation Corps, Washington, Press release, January 13, 1941.

²¹ *The Civilian Conservation Corps, op. cit.*, p. 19.

²² According to Ira De A. Reid, "The National Youth Administration has done much to offset racial discrimination in the relief administration of many southern states, especially in cities" (*In a Minor Key, Negro Youth in Story and Fact*, American Council on Education, Washington, 1940, p. 70).

The same difficulties arise in attempting to compare the representation of Negroes on NYA with their representation in the general population of approximately the same age, however, that were mentioned in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps; namely, the changes in geographic distribution of Negro youth during the last decade and the factor of greater economic need among Negroes than whites.

²³ National Youth Administration, Division of Negro Affairs, Washington.

²⁴ Data for youth employed on NYA work projects in Rhode Island, Kentucky, Georgia, Nebraska, Colorado, Oregon, and the District of Columbia for the week ending February 25, 1939, indicate that white youth tend to remain on the program slightly longer than Negro youth (Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration, Division of Finance and Statistics, Washington).

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Table 106.- Estimated Employment of Negro Youth on NYA Programs, January, 1940

Program	
<u>Out-of-school work program</u>	
Total employed	311,918
Negro youth employed	
Number	40,200
Per cent	12.9
<u>Student work program</u>	
Total employed	437,457
Negro youth employed	
Number	42,600
Per cent	9.7

Source: National Youth Administration, Division of Negro Affairs, Washington.

and 72,000 on the out-of-school work program. During the first five years of the operation of the NYA about 300,000 Negro boys and girls had part-time work.²⁵

So far as the other programs of the NYA, which have dealt with vocational information and training, are concerned, there are few comparable data on the assistance given to Negro and white youth. NYA-sponsored classes in occupations available to Negroes have been given in many localities, however; several states have prepared bulletins on occupations for Negroes, and other states have made surveys of the needs of Negro youth.²⁶

Negroes have been represented to a greater extent in the administration of the NYA than in the administration of the CCC, although not in proportion to their participation in the work programs. A Division of Negro Affairs in the national administration was established in 1935. In 1940, 27 states had State Supervisors of Negro Affairs and more than 500 Negroes were project supervisors. In the same year Negroes were members of State Advisory Committees in 23 states and of many local planning boards.²⁷

Student Work Program

For any detailed analysis of the Negro on NYA it is necessary to consider the programs separately, as the types of activities and the

²⁵ Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration, *The Tenth Youth*, Washington, 1940, p. 2.

²⁶ Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration, *NYA and Negro Youth* (Mimeograph No. 0835), Washington, p. 6.

²⁷ Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration, *The Tenth Youth*, op. cit., p. 18.

bases of selection differ. Thus, the student work program was set up to provide financial assistance on a work basis for youth who otherwise could not attend school. Under this program young people 16-24 years of age attending school are eligible for part-time employment. In practice this is a type of federal aid for education designed to provide partial support for needy students. As such it is of particular significance for Negro students.

Writing in 1938, Johnson and Harvey²⁸ summarized the data on Negro youth in the NYA up to that time. They found that in 12 southern states²⁹ and the District of Columbia 23.4 per cent of all pupils receiving school aid and 14 per cent of college and graduate aid recipients were Negroes. Since in 1930 Negroes constituted 25.8 per cent of all persons 15-19 years of age in these states, and 25.5 per cent of all persons 20-24 years of age, they concluded that "probably Negroes are proportionately represented on the school aid program, but are underrepresented on the college and graduate aid program."³⁰

The proportion of Negroes among those receiving NYA school aid in December, 1939, was somewhat lower than the proportion of Negroes in the total population 15-19 years of age in 17 southern states in 1930 (Table 107). The 6 states in this group in which the proportion of Negroes on NYA exceeded their proportion in the population were border states. The lowest representation of Negroes on the program proportionately occurred in Mississippi and Arkansas. In all nonsouthern states combined, Negroes were greatly overrepresented on the student work program, according to this basis.

Comparisons can also be made on the basis of the proportion Negroes constituted of all secondary-school pupils in the school year 1937-38, as only those attending school are eligible for this type of assistance. Even taking into account the fact that the NYA proportions include a few elementary-school pupils,³¹ Negro youth attending school have received more aid proportionately than white youth (Table 124). This is true for every southern state. The problem, however, centers in the more limited school attendance of Negro than white youth in general as the need for opportunities for more

²⁸ Palmer O. Johnson and Oswald L. Harvey, *The National Youth Administration*, Staff Study No. 13, The Advisory Committee on Education, Washington, 1938, pp. 33-34.

²⁹ Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

³⁰ Palmer O. Johnson and Oswald L. Harvey, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

³¹ Only 5 per cent of all Negro youth receiving NYA aid in 1939-40 were below the eighth grade (Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration, *Youth on the Student Work Program*, Washington, 1940, p. 78).

Table 107. - Proportion of Negroes among Recipients of NYA School Aid, as of December, 1939, among Pupils in Secondary Schools, 1937-38, and in the Total Population 15-19 Years of Age, 1930, by States

State	Recipients of NYA school aid			Negroes as per cent of pupils in secondary school	Per cent of Negroes in total population, 15-19 years of age
	Negro	All races	Per cent Negro		
United States total	35,500	314,559	11.3	b	10.8
17 southern states	22,798	112,967	20.2	11.0	24.9
Missouri	717	8,836	8.1	4.3	5.4
Delaware	57	371	15.4	8.1	14.1
Maryland	584	2,305	25.3	11.9	17.4
Virginia	1,237	4,927	25.1	13.9	28.7
West Virginia	606	5,927	10.2	5.9	5.7
North Carolina	1,598	6,355	25.1	18.2	31.9
South Carolina	2,205	5,048	43.7	17.8	50.4
Georgia	3,466	8,901	38.9	11.9	40.1
Florida	1,389	4,501	30.9	13.1	31.4
Kentucky	688	7,445	9.2	7.2	8.0
Tennessee	1,325	8,308	15.9	11.7	18.8
Alabama	2,601	8,886	29.3	14.6	37.1
Mississippi	1,052	6,252	16.8	13.0	51.7
Arkansas	670	4,969	13.5	8.6	25.9
Louisiana	1,567	4,994	31.4	14.0	37.4
Oklahoma	1,389	10,104	13.7	5.2	7.4
Texas	1,647	14,838	11.1	9.9	15.3
All other states..	12,702	201,592	6.3	b	2.5

a. Available to young people 16-24 years of age who are attending elementary or secondary school.

b. Data not available.

Sources: Special tabulation, Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration, Division of Finance and Statistics; Special tabulation, U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education; and Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population, Vol. III, United States Summary, Tables 20 and 46.

formal and vocational education is unquestionably greater among Negro than white youth.

What has been said of the representation of Negroes in the NYA school work program is true in even greater degree for the Negroes in the NYA college and graduate student work program (Table 108). In every southern state except Tennessee and West Virginia, and in all other states as a whole, Negroes are not represented in college and graduate student aid to the extent of their proportion in the total population 20-24 years of age. The underrepresentation is most extreme in Mississippi. On the other hand, taking the proportion of Negroes among college and university students as a basis for comparison, it is found that Negroes are considerably overrepresented on the NYA student aid program. But, again, Negroes do not attend colleges and universities to the same extent as whites²² because

²² Data are not available on Negro enrollments in colleges and universities in states outside the South, but it can be taken for granted that Negroes in other areas also do not attend colleges and universities to the same extent as whites.

Table 108.—Proportion of Negroes among Recipients of NYA College and Graduate Aid, December, 1939, among Students in Colleges and Universities, 1935-36, and in the Total Population, 1930, by States

State	Recipients of NYA college and graduate aid			Negroes as per cent of students in colleges and universities ^a	Per cent of Negroes in total population 20-24 years of age
	Negro	All races	Per cent Negro		
United States total	7,100	119,488	5.9	b	11.1
17 southern states -	5,282	37,934	13.9	9.5	24.8
Missouri	128	3,258	3.9	0.6	6.6
Delaware	14	138	10.1	9.9	14.8
Maryland	188	1,287	14.6	5.2	18.8
Virginia	441	2,285	19.3	14.6	26.0
West Virginia	191	1,302	14.7	8.4	7.3
North Carolina	533	3,234	16.5	16.3	31.2
South Carolina	323	1,797	18.0	18.7	46.1
Georgia	542	2,700	20.1	15.4	39.0
Florida	253	1,175	21.5	13.2	35.1
Kentucky	148	1,827	8.1	5.0	9.0
Tennessee	496	2,262	21.9	14.3	19.8
Alabama	377	1,948	19.4	19.1	37.4
Mississippi	272	2,032	13.4	6.8	52.3
Arkansas	223	1,182	18.9	5.9	28.1
Louisiana	381	2,174	17.5	10.7	38.5
Oklahoma	182	3,069	5.9	3.2	7.7
Texas	590	6,264	9.4	7.1	15.8
All other states ...	1,818	81,554	2.2	b	3.5

a. During the regular session. Exclusive of students in preparatory departments.

b. Data not available.

Sources: Special tabulation, Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration, Division of Finance and Statistics; U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, *Biennial Survey of Education: 1934-36*, Vol. II, Chapter IV, pp. 48-49, and *Statistics of the Education of Negroes, 1933-34 and 1935-36*, Bulletin No. 13, 1938, pp. 37-43; and *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population*, Vol. III, United States Summary, Tables 20 and 46.

of economic need and because of the lesser availability in the South of institutions of higher learning for Negroes. As a result Negro youth cannot take full advantage of this federal program of aid to needy students even though most Negro colleges are participants in its benefits.⁸³ While the NYA has made it possible for large numbers of Negro youth to remain in school, it has contributed little to the equalization of educational opportunities between Negro and white youth.⁸⁴

⁸³ In December, 1939, there were 113 Negro colleges participating in the NYA college and graduate student aid program. There are only about 120 Negro colleges in the United States.

⁸⁴ In addition to the regular program of aid to college and graduate students, a special fund has been set aside to make it possible for Negro youth living in states which lack adequate facilities for higher education for Negroes to study in other states. In 1939-40 this fund totaled \$105,000 and was allocated to 640 college and graduate students (Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration, *NYA and Negro Youth*, op. cit., p. 2).

That the student work program has primarily benefited Negro youth in needy circumstances is indicated by the fact that during the school year 1939-40 the median income of the families of the students receiving assistance was only \$332. For students on the school work program the median family income was \$300, and for those on the college work program it was \$554.⁸⁵

Out-of-school Work Program

The out-of-school work program of the National Youth Administration was developed to help unemployed youth 18 through 24 years of age by provision of useful part-time work. With the development of the program the age limit was reduced under certain conditions to 16 years. As pointed out above, Negro youth have been

Table 109. - Proportion of Negroes among Youth Employed on NYA Out-of-school Work Projects, December, 1939, and in the Total Population 15-24 Years of Age, 1930, by States

State	Youth Employed on Out-of-school Work Projects			Per cent of Negroes in total population, 15-24 years of age
	Negro	All races	Per cent Negro	
United States total	36,752	285,659	12.9	10.9
17 southern states and District of Columbia	22,768	117,669	19.3	24.9
Missouri	2,319	12,978	17.9	6.0
Delaware	124	438	28.3	14.5
Maryland	889	3,531	25.2	18.1
District of Columbia	768	1,077	71.3	29.8
Virginia	1,377	6,240	22.1	27.5
West Virginia	290	5,366	5.4	6.5
North Carolina	2,710	10,195	26.6	31.6
South Carolina	1,239	4,118	30.1	48.5
Georgia	1,560	6,435	24.2	39.6
Florida	1,288	4,315	29.8	33.2
Kentucky	593	6,494	9.1	8.5
Tennessee	1,071	7,371	14.5	19.3
Alabama	1,876	7,105	26.4	37.3
Mississippi	769	5,610	13.7	52.0
Arkansas	832	7,003	11.9	26.9
Louisiana	1,175	5,608	21.0	37.9
Oklahoma	408	5,726	7.1	7.6
Texas	3,480	18,059	19.3	15.5
All other states	13,984	167,990	8.3	2.8

Sources: Special tabulation, Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration, Division of Finance and Statistics; and Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population, Vol. III, U. S. Summary, Tables 20 and 46.

⁸⁵ Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration, *Youth on the Student Work Program*, op. cit., pp. 81-82.

represented proportionately on this program in terms of the percentage they constitute of all youth. On the basis of section of the country, however, they were underrepresented in the South in December, 1939, and overrepresented in all other states considered as a whole (Table 109). Since the percentage of all youth on the NYA out-of-school work program who were Negroes was about the same in March, 1941, as in December, 1939, it can be assumed that the regional picture had not changed significantly. The underrepresentation of Negroes in the South was found in about 2 out of 3 states.

This situation was at least partly due to the problem of securing sponsors for projects. Most projects have had a "co-operating sponsor," which is a public agency that organizes the project with the consent of the state NYA director and contributes supervision and equipment.⁸⁶ Since southern Negroes have relatively few organizations of a public service character, there are few eligible sponsors in the Negro group itself; and since local governments in the South are controlled entirely by whites, there have been obvious difficulties in obtaining public agencies as sponsors of separate Negro projects. Also the problem of the sponsor's contribution operates as a deterrent to white sponsors fully meeting the needs of Negroes for projects. This has been reflected particularly in the inadequacy of projects in rural areas for Negro youth. So far as the benefits of the program are concerned, Negro youth in urban areas have had a definite advantage over those in rural areas.⁸⁷

Negro youth have been employed on a variety of NYA work projects. The proportions they constituted of workers on construction and improvement projects have been similar to their proportions among all workers (Table 110). They have been found in especially large proportions on professional- and technical-assistance projects and in relatively small proportions on clerical-assistance and service projects.⁸⁸

One of the most publicized aspects of the out-of-school work pro-

⁸⁶ A cosponsor may be "a federal department, a state, a political subdivision thereof, or other legally constituted public agencies. Private agencies may not act as co-sponsors of NYA projects but can cooperate with public agencies co-sponsoring projects on useful public work" (Letter of John H. Lasher, Director, Division of Work Projects, National Youth Administration, Washington, August 5, 1940).

⁸⁷ See *Proceedings of the Second National Conference on the Problems of the Negro and Negro Youth*, op. cit., p. 53.

⁸⁸ Among Negro youth on the program a little over half of the boys (56.8 per cent) and less than half of the girls (46.8 per cent) had had private employment only. Most of their experience had been in unskilled labor or as domestics (Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration, *Characteristics of Youth Employed on NYA Work Projects*, Washington, 1939, pp. 7-8).

gram has been the resident work centers. Young people live at the project site and obtain work experience and related training. Of the 36,752 Negro youth employed on the out-of-school work program in December, 1939, 3,836 or 10.5 per cent were employed in 67 Negro Resident Training Centers (Table 110). During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, more than 7,500 Negro youth spent some time in resident projects.³⁹ That South Carolina accounted for 1,800 of them and Georgia for more than 1,000 reflects the adaptability of the centers to youth from rural and town areas in which it is difficult to establish local projects.

Beginning with July 1, 1942, all non-defense activities of the NYA except a limited student work program were abolished.

CONCLUSION

Although youth have benefited either directly or indirectly from other agencies, the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration were the two programs set up by the federal government specifically to meet the problems of youth. In terms of the population as a whole, Negro youth have had proportional representation on these programs, at least in recent years. Because of the greater poverty among Negro than white youth, however, they have not been cared for in proportion to actual need. Chief difficulties apparently have been the method of selection of CCC enrollees, the fact that Negroes do not attend schools and colleges to the same extent as whites, and the problem of obtaining sponsorship for Negro out-of-school work projects. Numbers of individuals participating in the programs either as enrollees or in administrative capacities are not the only measures for evaluating the programs in relation to the Negro, however. The specific benefits derived must also be taken into account.

So far as the treatment of Negro enrollees in the Civilian Conservation Corps was concerned, there was no difference from whites at any time in the amounts earned as a maximum basic cash allowance of \$30 was specified in the original law.⁴⁰ Enrollees, Negro and white alike, benefited from the inculcation of regular work habits, from the training and discipline provided, and from the healthful living conditions of the camps. To the extent that Negro youth came from more disadvantaged groups than whites, they probably

³⁹ Federal Security Agency, National Youth Administration, *The Tenth Youth*, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

⁴⁰ Those with some leadership responsibility could earn \$36 and \$45 per month. In June, 1940, approximately 2,000 colored project assistants, leaders, and assistant leaders were on duty in CCC camps (Edgar G. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. i).

profited proportionately more on an individual basis from the CCC program.

In the National Youth Administration earnings are specified without regard to color or section of the country. Negro youth have been enabled to remain in school and at the same time to acquire both training and work experience. Among college students the work in so far as possible has been related to their particular interests and educational courses. Negro youth employed on out-of-school work projects have likewise obtained valuable work experience, usually supplemented by informal related instruction.

Chapter XV

CATEGORICAL ASSISTANCE

The year 1935 saw the enactment of the Social Security Act. This has meant far-reaching changes in the organization of the types of public assistance covered by its provisions. Through the Social Security Act the principle of categorical assistance—i.e., assistance to special categories of needy persons in their own homes—has been generally established throughout the United States. The Act provides for federal grants-in-aid to the states for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children. In order to qualify for such grants, the state plans for these three types of assistance have to comply with the provisions of the Social Security Act and to be approved by the Social Security Board.¹

Favored by public support and political pressure, old-age assistance has experienced a more rapid advance than the two other programs and today represents the most extensive welfare activity of the states. All 48 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories of Hawaii and Alaska operate old-age assistance plans under the Act. In contrast, in 1939-40 aid to dependent children was given only in 40 states, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii under plans approved by the Social Security Board.² In 41 states, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii, approved plans for aid to the blind were in operation.³

During the few years in which the provisions of the Social Security Act have been in operation, there has been a rapid increase in the number of persons aided under each of the three special types of public assistance. Concurrently, greater uniformity in eligibility

¹ Now part of the Federal Security Agency. For information concerning the administration of the three programs, see the *Annual Reports of the Social Security Board* and the *Social Security Bulletin*.

² No federal-state program existed in Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Mississippi, Nevada, South Dakota, Texas, and Alaska.

³ The seven states without such plans were Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Texas. Alaska also did not have a plan.

requirements from state to state, improved administrative procedures, and higher standards of adequacy in meeting need have been developed. At the same time there has been a definite trend toward liberalization of eligibility requirements.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

By its very nature aid to the aged must be confined to certain age groups. The Social Security Act stipulates that no plan can have an age requirement of more than 65 years⁴ and that the recipient of assistance cannot be an inmate of a public institution. The Act also establishes maximum residence requirements, but it does not specify what constitutes need. Many states have defined need as "insufficient income to provide reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health" and then qualified the definition with various property limitations. This leaves the way open for wide differences in interpretation and administration. Moreover, except for the maximum amount established for federal reimbursement, there is no uniform standard for the size of old-age assistance grants, resulting not only in variations in grants from state to state but also in variations within a given state. The size of the payment is frequently determined on the basis of a standard budget with the payment making up the difference between the budget and available income.⁵ The fact that the existing administrative organization of old-age assistance leaves room for differential policies is especially important from the point of view of Negroes who are in particular need of this type of assistance. The economic opportunities of the majority of Negroes are such that they seldom accumulate during their working years sufficient reserves to provide for their old age. Moreover, old-age insurance, as set up under the Social Security Act, offers no solution to their problem because the majority of Negro workers are found in agriculture and in domestic and personal service,⁶ both of which are excluded from insurance under the provisions of the Act.

How far, then, have Negroes benefited from old-age assistance? The available statistics do not give the total number of Negroes who at present receive this type of categorical assistance. Some informa-

⁴ Until January 1, 1940, an age requirement of as much as 70 years was allowed.

⁵ As of July 1, 1941, an amendment to the Social Security Act provides for "the consideration of all income and resources of an applicant in determining his need for assistance." (See *Fifth Annual Report of the Social Security Board, 1940, Washington, 1941, p. 115.*)

⁶ According to the 1930 census, 36 per cent of all gainfully employed Negroes 10 years of age and over were employed in agriculture and 29 per cent in domestic and personal service.

tion on the representation of Negroes in old-age assistance plans, however, is contained in the data on recipients accepted during a selected period of the fiscal year 1936-37 and during the entire fiscal years of 1937-38, 1938-39, and 1939-40.⁷

For a selected period of the fiscal year 1936-37, Negroes constituted 11.2 per cent of all recipients accepted for old-age assistance.⁸ At that time a number of states with large Negro populations—i.e., Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia—did not yet have plans approved by the Social Security Board. In 1937-38, however, when Virginia was the only state with a considerable Negro population which was excluded, the proportion of Negroes among all recipients of old-age assistance accepted during the twelve-month period was only slightly higher (13.5 per cent) (Table III). In 1938-39 the corresponding percentage was 12.5,

Table III.—Negro Recipients of Old-age Assistance Accepted during the Fiscal Years 1937-38, 1938-39, and 1939-40 in Continental United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or more in 1930; Negro Recipients as Per Cent of All Recipients, Negroes as Per Cent of Total Population 65 Years of Age and Over in 1930, and Nonwhites as Per Cent of Total Population 65 Years of Age and Over, 1940

State	Negro recipients			Negro recipients as per cent of all recipients			Negroes as per cent of population 65 years of age and over, 1930	Nonwhites as per cent of population 65 years of age and over, 1940
	1937-38	1938-39	1939-40	1937-38	1938-39	1939-40		
United States total	78,589	46,687	39,713	13.5	12.8	11.2	9.6	7.1
New York	1,045	800	1,049	4.5	4.4	4.6	1.1	2.0
New Jersey	871	685	720	12.6	12.6	12.3	2.6	b/
Pennsylvania	934	517	3,441	4.6	4.5	8.6	1.8	2.8
Ohio	1,349	1,016	1,515	7.1	6.0	7.6	2.1	3.1
Indiana	396	1,317	561	4.3	4.7	5.4	1.8	b/
Illinois	2,100	1,857	1,569	8.4	8.4	8.2	1.9	3.1
Michigan	1,267	1,446	79	3.0	2.1	9.2	1.1	2.0
Missouri	1,713	644	2,062	5.9	5.5	7.2	3.8	g/
Maryland	1,496	803	1,030	30.2	27.7	30.3	10.8	11.8
District of Columbia	584	305	262	59.2	53.7	49.1	15.7	b/
Virginia	-	5,658	2,523	-	37.1	39.9	21.9	21.8
West Virginia	268	232	187	6.0	7.9	6.3	3.4	4.7
North Carolina	11,162	2,329	2,252	33.6	28.4	32.1	22.5	25.6
South Carolina	13,234	4,061	1,057	54.2	61.2	54.9	39.0	40.0
Georgia	12,806	3,133	549	35.2	42.0	49.0	31.1	33.0
Florida - - -	6,394	4,584	1,044	30.3	39.4	33.2	15.2	18.4
Kentucky - -	782	2,204	1,064	13.6	14.9	13.6	8.9	8.4
Tennessee	5,224	982	5,053	21.2	25.6	29.3	15.3	17.3
Alabama	2,756	2,499	2,433	42.6	47.6	39.7	31.6	33.8
Mississippi	809	2,494	1,904	40.6	43.1	42.6	42.7	47.1
Arkansas	1,943	747	1,463	27.9	27.4	23.0	19.4	23.2
Louisiana	3,369	3,649	3,017	39.7	44.9	51.8	31.7	35.7
Oklahoma	677	609	862	9.1	6.9	8.9	5.5	9.3
Texas	1,453	2,382	2,089	20.4	21.8	19.7	11.2	13.7

g/ In 1930, 8.9 per cent of the population 65 years of age and over was nonwhite.

b/ Data not yet available.

Sources: Social Security Board, Bureau of Research and Statistics, *Social Data - Old-Age Assistance*, Fiscal Year 1937-38, Tables, p.29; Federal Security Board, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Bureau Memorandum No. 42, *Social Data on Recipients of Public Assistance Accepted in 1938-1939*, Part I, Old-Age Assistance, Tables, p.30; Federal Security Board, Bureau of Public Assistance, Research Memorandum No. 1, *Social Data on Recipients of Public Assistance Accepted in 1939-1940*, Part I, Old-Age Assistance, Tables, p. 29; *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1930*, Population, Vol.III, United States Summary, Table 46; and *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940*, Preliminary releases, Series R-3a.

⁷ The number of recipients accepted is, of course, not identical with the total number of persons receiving old-age assistance during those years but refers only to cases accepted each year.

⁸ *Second Annual Report of the Social Security Board, 1937*, Washington, 1938, p. 149.

and in 1939-40 it fell to 11.2. If the proportion of Negroes in the total number of recipients accepted is compared with their proportion in the age group 65 years and over in 1930 (5.6 per cent) and with the proportion nonwhites constituted of that age group in 1940 (7.1 per cent),⁹ it becomes evident that Negro representation on the old-age assistance program exceeded the population ratio. This was particularly true in the northern states, but most of the southern states also had a greater proportion of Negroes among their old-age assistance acceptances than among the aged in general, although the differences, by and large, were much smaller than in the North.

To interpret correctly the significance of these data, it must be borne in mind that there is a high proportion of dependency among aged Negroes and that, therefore, their need for old-age assistance is greater than in the case of whites. Full equality of treatment would entail a high degree of overrepresentation of aged Negroes in terms of their proportions in the general population of various states. Thus it is not likely that Negroes are disproportionately aided in terms of their economic situation. The Social Security Board itself in the annual report for 1938-39 points out the possibility that "the number of Negroes to whom aid was granted during the year was low in proportion to the number who needed assistance."¹⁰

Negro recipients accepted for old-age assistance have been consistently older, on the average, than white recipients (Table 112). Proportionately more whites than Negroes are in the age group 65-69 years; in all subsequent age groups the situation is reversed. This holds for both males and females. It appears likely that welfare agencies are more inclined to consider Negroes under 70 years of age able to support themselves by odd jobs than whites of corresponding age and also that the agencies have greater difficulties in ascertaining the ages of Negroes than whites, which may cause delays in accepting the former on the program. Since the definitions of need in the various state plans are not precise, they make such differential treatment possible. This leads, however, to even greater overrepresentation of Negroes on old-age assistance in the group 70 years of age and over than the data for all aged indicate.

Because of the nature of the program it is to be expected that the average age of persons accepted from year to year will decline as the accumulation of aged is gradually cared for and the number attaining the minimum age of eligibility annually bulks larger among the applicants. That this process is affecting the Negro group is obvi-

⁹ Data for Negroes only are not yet available.

¹⁰ *Fourth Annual Report of the Social Security Board, for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1939*, Washington, 1940, p. 92.

ous, as among males those 65-69 years of age rose from 31 per cent of the recipients accepted in 1937-38 to 47 per cent in 1939-40 (Table 112). The corresponding proportions for females were 32 per cent and 47 per cent, respectively.¹¹

Table 112. - Per Cent Distribution by Race, Sex, and Age of Recipients of Old-age Assistance Accepted during the Fiscal Years 1937-38, 1938-39, a/ and 1939-40, for All States b/

Fiscal Year, Race and Sex	Number of Recipients Accepted	Per Cent Distribution by Age c/						
		Total	60-64 years	65-69 years	70-74 years	75-79 years	80 years and over	Age un- known
1937-38								
Negro								
Male	39,274	100.0	0.1	31.2	33.3	17.4	17.3	0.7
Female	39,617	100.0	0.1	31.9	32.5	17.1	17.4	1.0
White								
Male	264,387	100.0	0.5	39.5	31.3	17.3	11.3	0.1
Female	238,411	100.0	0.7	40.4	30.2	17.0	11.6	0.1
1938-39								
Negro								
Male	23,958	100.0	0.1	41.6	31.8	14.2	10.7	1.6
Female	22,931	100.0	0.1	40.3	31.1	13.8	12.2	2.5
White								
Male	173,206	100.0	0.3	53.4	27.6	11.5	7.0	0.2
Female	155,358	100.0	0.4	52.5	26.5	12.1	8.3	0.2
1939-40								
Negro								
Male	20,665	100.0	0.1	46.6	31.5	12.7	8.4	0.7
Female	19,049	100.0	*	46.5	29.8	12.8	10.1	0.8
White								
Male	163,165	100.0	0.3	58.9	25.4	9.5	5.7	0.2
Female	149,555	100.0	0.4	59.0	23.6	9.8	7.0	0.2

*Less than 0.05 per cent.

a/ Includes only recipients who were accepted for old-age assistance for the first time, except approximately 1,000 recipients in Louisiana whose cases were reopened.

b/ Includes Alaska and Hawaii.

c/ The age of recipients accepted in 1937-38 is computed as of June 30, 1938, of those accepted in 1938-39 as of June 30, 1939, and of those accepted in 1939-40 as of June 30, 1940.

Sources: Social Security Board, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Social Data - Old Age Assistance, Fiscal Year 1937-38, Tables, p. 31; Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Bureau Memorandum No. 42, Social Data on Recipients of Public Assistance Accepted in 1938-1939, Part 1, Old Age Assistance, Tables, p. 32; and Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, Bureau of Public Assistance, Research Memorandum No. 1, Social Data on Recipients of Public Assistance Accepted in 1939-1940, Part 1, Old Age Assistance, Tables, p. 31, Washington.

The effectiveness of the old-age assistance program depends not only on coverage but also upon the amount of financial aid given to the recipients accepted. An analysis of the average amounts of monthly grants for old-age assistance paid under the various state plans (Table 113) shows that the lowest average payments to Negro recipients during the fiscal year 1939-40, those under \$8, were made

¹¹ The fact that the age limit in a few states was 70 years prior to January 1, 1940, does not account for this trend, as the southern states generally adopted 65 years as the minimum age.

Table 113. -. Average Monthly Payments to White and Negro Recipients of Old-age Assistance Accepted during the Fiscal Year 1939-40 in States Accepting 100 Negro Recipients or More

State	Average monthly payment per recipient			Amount by which average payment to Negro recipients is more (+) or less (-) than to white recipients
	Total	Negro	White	
Pennsylvania.....	\$21.41	\$24.23	\$21.14	+ \$3.09
Indiana.....	17.29	19.01	17.19	+ 1.82
New York.....	22.94	24.55	22.88	+ 1.67
Missouri.....	16.83	18.15	16.72	+ 1.43
Ohio.....	22.25	23.27	22.16	+ 1.11
Illinois.....	21.33	22.11	21.26	+ 0.85
California.....	33.95	34.73	33.92	+ 0.81
Kansas.....	16.96	16.91	16.97	-0.06
West Virginia.....	12.74	12.58	12.75	-0.17
Massachusetts.....	26.61	26.38	26.61	-0.23
Arkansas a/.....	6.68	6.36	6.78	-0.42
Kentucky.....	8.76	8.38	8.82	-0.44
Tennessee.....	9.46	9.00	9.61	-0.61
Oklahoma.....	17.31	16.77	17.40	-0.63
Virginia.....	9.33	8.86	9.65	-0.79
Maryland.....	16.14	15.32	16.50	-1.18
North Carolina.....	9.80	8.87	10.25	-1.38
Georgia.....	6.43	5.70	7.13	-1.43
New Jersey.....	19.36	18.04	19.55	-1.51
Delaware.....	12.33	10.86	12.97	-2.11
South Carolina.....	8.59	7.60	9.80	-2.20
Texas.....	13.34	11.39	13.81	-2.42
District of Columbia	25.01	23.61	26.40	-2.79
Louisiana.....	12.12	10.61	13.76	-3.15
Florida.....	11.56	9.37	12.66	-3.29
Alabama b/.....	18.91	16.81	20.30	-3.49
Mississippi.....	9.42	7.17	11.09	-3.92

a/ Preliminary data pending correction of report.

b/ Alabama reported the amount approved. In most instances this was more than the amount paid.

Sources: Data furnished by the Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, Bureau of Public Assistance, Washington, July 15, 1941.

in Arkansas, Georgia, South Carolina, and Mississippi. Five additional southern states made payments to Negroes which averaged under \$10. In contrast, six nonsouthern states and the District of Columbia reported average payments of more than \$20. The regional variations in old-age assistance grants reflect the more limited financial resources of the southern states. As the majority of aged Negroes are in the South, they of course are concentrated in the region of lowest old-age assistance benefits.

Comparison of monthly payments to Negro and white recipients indicates that in most states grants are slightly larger for whites. These race differentials, however, are much less important than differences among states (Table 113). Particularly in the South average grants are extremely small for Negroes and whites alike. In several southern states, however, the few dollars' difference between Negro and white payments is proportionately significant.

Average payments conceal significant variations in size of benefits (Appendix tables 65 and 66). In Florida 55 per cent of the Negro recipients accepted in comparison with only 21 per cent of the white recipients received \$5 to \$10. In Mississippi 88 per cent of the Negro recipients accepted but only 38 per cent of the white recipients received less than \$10 per month. The greater concentration of Negroes than whites on farms and the widespread tendency toward lower grants for farm than nonfarm families in various types of public assistance may partially account for the differences. The general belief in the South, moreover, that Negroes can get along on less than whites is another affecting factor.

As was pointed out above, old-age assistance is the most extensive and highly developed of the three programs of categorical assistance. In spite of the large number of aged Negroes on the program, however, there is little likelihood that the full need has yet been met. At the same time, average grants, particularly in the South, are inadequate for all recipients, with Negro grants even lower than those for whites. Yet the old-age assistance program has brought about a very considerable improvement in the economic position of the aged Negro.

AID TO THE BLIND

Under the Social Security Act provision is made for aid to individuals who are blind and in need. Blindness represents a particularly serious handicap for Negroes, whose rate of blindness is higher than that of whites. Data from the National Health Survey show a frequency rate for blindness in both eyes of 76 per 100,000 urban whites and of 146 per 100,000 urban colored.¹² The higher rate among the colored is associated with their lower level of living and the less adequate medical care which they receive. One of the specific reasons for the disparity is the greater prevalence of syphilis, an important cause of blindness, among the Negro than the white population. It is also significant that among the causes of blindness accidents show a higher rate for nonwhites than for whites. This difference is attributed to the fact that a much higher proportion of nonwhites than whites is employed at unskilled labor.¹³

In order correctly to appraise the adequacy of the program of aid

¹² Rollo H. Britten, "Blindness as Recorded in the National Health Survey—Amount, Causes, and Relation to Certain Social Factors," *Public Health Reports*, Vol. 56, November 14, 1941, p. 2205.

¹³ U. S. Public Health Service, *The National Health Survey, 1935-1936*, Preliminary reports, Sickness and Medical Care Series, Bulletin 10, Washington, 1938, p. 6.

to the blind with reference to Negroes, it would be necessary to know the number of blind Negroes in the total United States, but no accurate data are available. The 1930 census of the blind is considered incomplete owing to underenumeration,¹⁴ and there exists no other comprehensive statistical information. An unpublished study of the American Foundation for the Blind based on data for 17 states indicates that there are about 114,000 blind in the United States.¹⁵ This agrees closely with the minimum estimate of 117,000 based on the National Health Survey and the blind in institutions.¹⁶ If it can be assumed that the incidence of blindness does not vary greatly between urban and rural areas, it is possible on the basis of these totals roughly to estimate the number of blind persons in the United States by color. Such an estimate suggests that Negroes constitute not quite 20 per cent of the blind in the United States.

In the fiscal years 1937-38, 1938-39, and 1939-40, Negroes accounted for 22.6, 23.3, and 19.9 per cent, respectively, of all recipients accepted for aid to the blind (Table 114.)¹⁷ in states with plans approved for federal participation. This indicates that the Negro blind probably receive aid at roughly the same rate or a slightly higher rate than whites who are blind. The blind of neither race, however, has yet been adequately covered by the program. Since need is greater among the Negro blind, they are proportionately less adequately cared for than whites. The numbers receiving assistance of course do not include those in institutions, who are outside the scope of this analysis, but there again Negroes are at a disadvantage.

Data on acceptances for aid to the blind in the states, including the District of Columbia, with 100,000 Negroes or more in the general population in 1930 show that Negroes constituted more than 50 per cent of the recipients accepted in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, and South Carolina in at least one of the three fiscal years 1937-38 to 1939-40. In general Negroes constitute a considerably higher proportion of the recipients accepted for aid to the blind than they do of the total population in the various states, but no data are available for determining whether or not Negroes are

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

¹⁵ White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, Report of the Committee on Physically and Mentally Handicapped, *The Handicapped Child*, Washington, 1933, pp. 46-47.

¹⁶ *The National Health Survey, 1935-1936, op. cit.*, p. 1.

¹⁷ Negroes constituted 11 per cent of all recipients accepted during a selected period of the fiscal year 1936-37 in the 26 states and the District of Columbia which had approved plans (*Second Annual Report of the Social Security Board, 1937*, Washington, 1938, p. 162).

Table 114.- Negro Recipients of Aid to the Blind Accepted ^{a/} during the Fiscal Years 1937-38, 1938-39, and 1939-40 in Continental United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930, Negro Recipients as Per Cent of all Recipients, and Per Cent of Negroes in the General Population, 1930

	Negro recipients			Negro recipients as per cent of all recipients			Negroes as per cent of total population 1930.
	1937-1938	1938-1939	1939-1940	1937-1938	1938-1939	1939-1940	
United States total	4,741	2,604	1,679	22.6	23.3	19.9	9.7
New York	128	64	52	12.0	12.4	10.7	3.3
New Jersey	34	33	64	23.9	27.3	27.7	5.2
Pennsylvania ^{b/}	167	141	-	6.8	6.5	-	4.5
Ohio	95	82	71	12.7	15.5	14.7	4.7
Indiana	65	21	27	8.7	6.0	9.8	3.5
Illinois	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michigan	19	4	17	7.1	1.3	6.9	3.5
Missouri	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	70	56	49	48.6	51.4	t	16.9
District of Columbia	64	28	24	t	t	t	27.1
Virginia	-	432	163	-	46.5	55.3	26.8
West Virginia	283	15	16	13.0	11.5	11.9	6.6
North Carolina	885	125	137	39.6	32.8	40.2	29.0
South Carolina	571	153	153	60.3	69.1	65.7	45.6
Georgia	578	123	16	49.7	54.9	t	36.8
Florida	635	395	156	41.7	37.4	48.6	29.4
Kentucky	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	451	112	113	35.9	29.7	44.8	18.3
Alabama	159	92	75	51.3	56.8	51.0	35.7
Mississippi	-	422	178	-	70.2	68.7	50.2
Arkansas	22	25	120	t	t	38.3	25.6
Louisiana	394	186	114	57.1	59.8	50.7	36.9
Oklahoma	101	42	46	12.3	11.8	12.6	7.2
Texas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

t Fewer than 100 recipients.

^{a/} In states with approved plans.

^{b/} Not receiving federal aid in 1939-40.

Sources: Social Security Board, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Bureau Memorandum No. 39, Social Data on Recipients of Public Assistance Accepted in 1937-1938, Part 3, Aid to the Blind, Tables, p. 25; Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Bureau Memorandum No. 42, Social Data on Recipients of Public Assistance Accepted in 1938-1939, Part 3, Aid to the Blind, Tables, p. 25; Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, Bureau of Public Assistance, Research Memorandum No. 1, Social Data on Recipients of Public Assistance Accepted in 1939-1940, Part 3, Aid to the Blind, Tables, p. 24; and Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population, Vol. 11, Chap. 2, Table 11.

represented on this program in proportion to the relative incidence of blindness in individual states. It is striking that the proportion of Negroes is generally higher among all persons receiving aid to the blind than it is among the acceptances for old-age assistance and aid to dependent children.

Blindness tends to be more prevalent in low income groups than in high income groups. According to the National Health Survey, the rate of blindness per 100,000 population among urban Negroes was 118 for the nonrelief group but 193 for the relief group.¹⁸ This is affected by the fact that the blind are more likely to receive relief because of their greater need than are the seeing, but data for whites, which are available by income classes, substantiate the fact that the incidence of blindness declines markedly with rising income.

In considering the size of the grants under the program of aid to the blind, attention should again be called to the fact that the greatest number of Negroes and, consequently, also of Negro blind is concentrated in an area in which average monthly grants for public assist-

¹⁸ *The National Health Survey, 1935-1936, op. cit.*, p. 6.

ance tend to be lower than elsewhere (Table 115). In a considerable number of states, however, grants to the blind are larger than

Table 115. - Median Monthly Payments Initially Approved for Recipients of Aid to the Blind in the United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930 Accepted during the Fiscal Year 1939-40, ^{a/} by Color

State	Median ^{b/} monthly payment		State	Median ^{b/} monthly payment	
	Negro	White		Negro	White
United States total ^{c/}	\$12	\$22	West Virginia .	t	\$16
New York	26	22	North Carolina	\$15	17
New Jersey	24	23	South Carolina	10	14
Pennsylvania	-	-	Georgia	t	t
Ohio	20	18	Florida	11	13
Indiana	21	19	Kentucky	-	-
Illinois	-	-	Tennessee	10	10
Michigan	t	17	Alabama ^{d/}	15	16
Missouri	-	-	Mississippi	7	10
Maryland	22	19	Arkansas	6	7
District of Columbia	t	t	Louisiana	11	15
Virginia	10	10	Oklahoma	11	14
			Texas	-	-

t Fewer than 25 recipients.

^{a/} In states with approved plans.

^{b/} Lower limit of the dollar interval in which the median falls.

^{c/} Includes Hawaii.

^{d/} Although the monthly payments reported by all other states is the amount of the first full monthly payment, Alabama reported the amount approved, which in most instances was more than the amount paid.

Source: Data furnished by the Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, Bureau of Public Assistance, Washington, July 31, 1941.

grants to the aged. In most southern states average monthly payments for the blind are lower for Negroes than for whites, with racial differences particularly significant in South Carolina, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Oklahoma. At the same time, all recipients accepted for aid to the blind in the southern states receive considerably lower average payments than the blind in northeastern states.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

The program of aid to dependent children under the Social Security Board covers children under 16 years of age, and in some cases those 16 and 17 years of age also if regularly attending school, who have been deprived of parental support or care by reason of the death, continued absence from home, or incapacity, either physical or mental, of a parent and who are living in their own homes or with near relatives. The majority of the states have adopted this definition in full. Negroes are particularly in need of a program of this type because approximately 30 per cent of Negro families are broken as compared with 20 per cent of native white families, and 19 per cent

of Negro families have a woman head. More than one-fifth of such Negro families in 1930 had three children or more under 21, while only one-tenth of the white broken families with a woman head had three children or more under 21. In the rural-farm areas of the South, households with three children or more constituted 41 per cent of the Negro broken families with a woman head. These facts indicate that the incidence of need is particularly high among Negro children. To this must be added another factor, the much higher proportion of illegitimate children in the Negro than the white population.¹⁹

Most of the states, however, have certain eligibility requirements which, depending upon the way they are interpreted by the agencies, may limit aid to dependent children to a greater extent for some groups than others. For example, a majority of the state plans require that a home be "suitable" and a few specify that the parent or guardian must be a proper person. Such regulations open the way for local interpretations, which may lead to discrimination against children of unmarried mothers and of other parents whose sexual conduct is not considered proper. To the extent that this may occur, it affects Negroes more than whites, since the Negro population includes a much larger segment which is characterized by a rather loose family structure. For the same reason, however, plus the fact of lower average incomes and lower levels of living, there is greater need for aid to dependent children among Negroes than whites.²⁰

Total figures on the extent to which Negro children benefit from the program of aid to dependent children under the Social Security Act are not available. As in the case of the other two special types of assistance, however, the number of recipients accepted each year throws considerable light on the coverage of the program.²¹ In 1939-40 Negro children accounted for 16.1 per cent of all children accepted for aid to dependent children as compared with the 10.7

¹⁹ See *Birth, Stillbirth, and Infant Mortality Statistics*, Annual reports, U. S. Bureau of the Census. In 1936, for example, there were 20.3 illegitimate births to 1,000 total births among whites but 162.4 illegitimate births per 1,000 among other races. Rates of illegitimate births were particularly high in South Carolina, Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, and the District of Columbia.

²⁰ Arthur F. Raper points out that in Georgia many Negro families do not apply for this type of assistance because of lack of knowledge concerning it. Also some Negro children receive aid through living in the same households with adults receiving old-age assistance (Letter of July 20, 1940). This, of course, is also true of whites.

²¹ During a selected period of the fiscal year 1936-37, Negro children accounted for 11.8 per cent of all children in 29 states and the District of Columbia accepted for aid to dependent children. A majority of the southern states were not yet participating in the program.

per cent which they constituted of all children in 1930 (Table 116).²² On the other hand, in several southern states, such as North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, Negro children were clearly underrepresented among the acceptances for aid to dependent children.

This conclusion is substantiated in the case of North Carolina and Georgia by data from surveys undertaken in those states in order to provide estimates of the number of eligible children. The North Carolina survey²³ included active cases on relief at any time from January to September 1, 1935, and unemployable cases which either were on relief during 1934 and turned over to the local agencies after January 1, 1935, or had been on federal relief intermittently from January 1, 1934, to September 1, 1935. In the group surveyed 7,426 Negro families with 19,427 children were considered eligible for aid to dependent children, as were 7,914 white families with 20,099 children. These estimates are probably too low rather than too high, especially for the Negro group, as they are based upon relief cases and do not take into account those in need who were not able to obtain relief. They put white and Negro eligibles at practically the same number, but, as Table 116 shows, Negro children made up less than 25 per cent of the acceptances in North Carolina in each of the three years covered.

The data for Georgia show an even greater disparity between need and coverage of the program. The estimates of the Georgia survey²⁴ were based on cases on emergency relief rolls in 1935 and on county outdoor relief in November, 1935; i.e., they did not encompass needy children who failed to secure relief. It was found that there were 53,075 dependent children among the relief population who would be eligible for aid. Of these, 23,974 were white and 29,100 were Negro children. In February, 1940, 3,458 white and 439 Negro children received assistance under the program of aid to dependent children; i.e., 14.4 per cent of the white eligibles but only 1.5 per cent of the Negro eligibles. From the inception of the program in July, 1937, through January, 1938, 4,984 white cases with a total of 13,263 children were approved for assistance in com-

²² Data are not included for state programs aiding dependent children which have no federal participation.

²³ North Carolina Emergency Relief Administration, *Social Security Survey of Emergency Relief Cases Covered by the Social Security Act*, Raleigh, N. C., 1936, pp. 5 and 10.

²⁴ Works Progress Administration of Georgia, *A Report of the Social Security Survey in Georgia*, Atlanta, Ga., Table 31, p. 119. This number also includes 32 children in almshouses.

Table 116.. Negro Children Accepted ^{a/} for Aid to Dependent Children during the Fiscal Years 1937-38, 1938-39, and 1939-40 in Continental United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930, Negro Children as Per Cent of All Children Accepted, and Negro Children as Per Cent of All Children under 16 Years of Age in the 1930 Population

State	Negro children accepted				Negro children as per cent of all children accepted				Negro children as per cent of all children under 16 years of age 1930
	1937-1938	1938-1939	1939-1940	1939-1940	1937-1938	1938-1939	1939-1940	1939-1940	
United States total	41,265	43,867	38,671	38,671	13.2	16.3	16.2	16.2	10.7
New York	1,346	7,303	3,117	3,117	7.6	25.3	19.2	19.2	2.8
New Jersey	1,285	1,042	914	914	18.4	18.7	18.5	18.5	5.1
Pennsylvania	905	11,115	9,999	9,999	7.1	27.7	24.3	24.3	3.9
Ohio	1,289	677	354	354	15.8	13.4	13.4	13.4	4.4
Indiana	2,246	1,290	865	865	14.7	11.9	10.2	10.2	3.1
Illinois	1,435	1,965	2,348	2,348	10.4	14.9	11.1	11.1	-
Michigan	1,653	1,699	1,792	1,792	14.9	7.6	23.6	23.6	5.3
Missouri	3,391	2,676	1,816	1,816	38.1	40.7	38.4	38.4	17.8
Maryland	772	312	448	448	65.4	21.0	66.4	66.4	30.0
District of Columbia	629	790	2,426	2,426	6.4	6.8	5.9	5.9	28.7
Virginia	4,949	1,291	1,461	1,461	22.3	20.8	22.3	22.3	5.7
North Carolina	3,523	2,136	626	626	29.5	33.1	34.4	34.4	30.3
South Carolina	1,582	308	57	57	12.1	12.2	10.5	10.5	48.4
Georgia	-	1,128	142	142	-	16.0	31.6	31.6	37.9
Florida	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29.3
Kentucky	4,793	121	2,314	2,314	15.2	9.5	15.8	15.8	-
Tennessee	2,325	1,988	1,671	1,671	25.4	28.7	26.1	26.1	16.6
Alabama	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35.4
Mississippi	490	1,034	2,952	2,952	14.8	19.0	20.2	20.2	24.5
Arkansas	2,911	3,346	2,952	2,952	25.6	28.1	33.2	33.2	37.2
Louisiana	2,799	2,176	2,042	2,042	18.2	15.8	17.3	17.3	6.9
Oklahoma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Texas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

^{a/} In states with approved plans.

^{b/} Preliminary data.

Sources: Social Security Board, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Bureau Memorandum No. 39, Social Data on Recipients of Public Assistance Accepted in 1937-1938, Part 2, Aid to Dependent Children, Tables, p. 30; Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Bureau Memorandum No. 42, Social Data on Recipients of Public Assistance Accepted in 1938-1939, Part 2, Aid to Dependent Children, Tables, p. 30; Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, Bureau of Public Assistance, Research Memorandum No. 1, Social Data on Recipients of Public Assistance in 1939-1940, Part 2, Aid to Dependent Children, Tables, p. 31; and Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population, Vol. II, Chap. X, Table 28.

parison with only 573 Negro cases with 1,769 children.²⁵ It is no doubt true that the coverage of white dependent children is far from complete if the relief estimates are taken as a basis, but, even so, the number of Negro children accepted for aid is insignificant. Of the small number of Negro cases, 304 or 53 per cent were concentrated in counties with cities of 10,000 or more population as against 18 per cent of the white cases. Furthermore, 115 of the 304 cases were found in Fulton County; i.e., in the metropolitan area of Atlanta. While the situation is slightly better in cities, the fact remains that Negro children in Georgia have scarcely benefited from aid to dependent children and have suffered more than white children from the inadequacies of the existing program.

So far as the size of payments in the program of aid to dependent children is concerned, the same regional and color differences observed in old-age assistance and aid to the blind are again found. Among families accepted during the fiscal year 1939-40, average monthly payments per child ranged from \$3.52 in Arkansas to \$24.15 in New York for Negroes and from \$4.24 to \$22.08 in the same states for whites (Table 117). In most southern states payments for both white and Negro children averaged under \$10 per month. Outside the South, Negro children usually received slightly higher average monthly payments than white children, while the reverse occurred in most southern states. Grants to white children were significantly higher proportionately than those to Negro children in South Carolina and Florida in particular. Racial differences in average monthly payments tended to be less pronounced on a family basis than on a per child basis. This is accounted for by differences in the number of children per family assisted, as in most southern states Negro families accepted for aid to dependent children were slightly larger on the average than the corresponding white families.

Aid to dependent children in its present form has been in operation for only a comparatively short time. In the few years, progress has been made: grants have been increased, administrative methods have improved, and rules and regulations have become more liberal. But it cannot be said, even with these improvements, that the various state programs, especially in the South, have given full recognition to the extent of need among Negro children or to their particular problems. On the contrary, as the above data have shown, Negro children in

²⁵ Georgia State Department of Public Welfare, Division of Research and Statistics, *Reasons for Dependency of Children Approved for Aid to Dependent Children*, Atlanta, Ga., 1939, Table 7, p. 14.

Table 117. - Average Monthly Payment per Family and per Child under Aid to Dependent Children in the United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930 for Families Accepted during the Fiscal Year 1939-40, a/ by Color

State	Negro		White	
	Per family	Per child	Per family	Per child
United States total <u>b/</u>	\$30.25	\$13.09	\$30.73	\$12.68
New York	44.36	24.15	46.56	22.08
New Jersey	31.96	12.45	32.35	13.44
Pennsylvania	35.27	18.13	33.00	14.42
Ohio	45.45	15.18	36.66	12.39
Indiana	27.26	15.03	26.77	12.50
Illinois	-	-	-	-
Michigan	36.98	14.20	33.09	12.92
Missouri	34.24	13.09	33.21	12.08
Maryland	25.90	11.34	28.32	11.65
District of Columbia ..	38.89	12.24	38.41	13.20
Virginia	18.95	5.78	19.27	6.56
West Virginia	20.90	8.05	20.89	7.66
North Carolina	15.66	5.93	16.72	7.03
South Carolina	13.72	4.03	18.00	6.46
Georgia	<u>t/</u>	<u>t/</u>	17.83	6.74
Florida	21.16	7.30	26.14	10.61
Kentucky	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	18.89	7.38	17.95	7.23
Alabama <u>g/</u>	37.48	12.87	38.44	14.44
Mississippi	-	-	-	-
Arkansas <u>d/</u>	9.58	3.52	10.58	4.24
Louisiana	22.09	8.55	21.75	9.58
Oklahoma	11.83	5.37	13.40	5.74
Texas	-	-	-	-

t Fewer than 25 recipients.

a/ In states with approved plans.

b/ Includes Hawaii.

g/ Although the monthly payment reported by all other states is the amount of the first full monthly payment, Alabama reported the amount approved, which in most instances was more than the amount paid.

d/ Preliminary data.

Source: Data furnished by the Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, Bureau of Public Assistance, Washington, July 31, 1941.

a number of states have not shared equally with white children in the program. This is not the fault of the Social Security Act, which contains only the framework for the state plans. Neither are the provisions of the state plans openly discriminatory. Experience has shown, however, that community attitudes and traditions which favor differential treatment are strong enough to hold their own where rules and regulations are not sufficiently explicit or leave too much to the initiative of individuals, and this unfortunately is widely evident in the case of needy children.

Chapter XVI

GENERAL RELIEF AFTER 1935

With the termination of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration in 1935, the federal government withdrew from the general relief field except for the distribution of surplus commodities and the allocation of emergency grants under the rural rehabilitation program.¹ As a result, cases not covered by the special programs for employable persons unable to obtain private or other public employment, for dependent children, the blind, and the aged, and for low-income farm families became the responsibility of the states and local communities. Such cases included families with no employable member, families with more members than the meager earnings of the breadwinner could support, families whose WPA earnings or public assistance grants were too small to meet even elementary needs, and families with temporary or other long-time problems which did not qualify them for the federal programs. At the same time the coverage of the federal and federal-aided programs was by no means complete so that it was necessary to give assistance to the needy who were eligible for, but not aided by, such programs.² This situation was particularly marked immediately following the liquidation of the FERA when not even the old-age assistance program had been instituted in all states.³ Also the fact that federal appropriations for

¹ See p. 295.

² For example, 11.2 per cent of the \$1,268,620 expended for general relief by the state and local communities in Virginia during the biennium ending June 30, 1939, was for persons over 65 years of age, 16.2 per cent for child care, 30.5 per cent for employables, 40.5 per cent for unemployables, and the remainder for aid to the blind and to transients (*Biennial Report for the State Department of Public Welfare for Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1938, and June 30, 1939*, Richmond, Va., 1939, p. 30). In Chicago 56.6 per cent of all white cases on general relief in August and September, 1939, and 41.7 per cent of all Negro cases were classified as employable (Illinois Emergency Relief Commission, *Illinois Persons on Relief—1939*, Release No. 2, Springfield, Ill., Table 2a).

³ Limitation of general relief to persons ineligible for federal or federal-aided programs has been relatively common. Even in Baltimore, Md., where conditions were better than in most southern states, it was necessary to cut employable single

work relief and local sponsorship of and technical planning for work projects are not more closely synchronized with fluctuations in the need for work relief makes the role of the general relief programs still more significant. Together with unemployment compensation they tend to receive the first impact of every new decline in employment.

In January, 1941, almost 5,500,000 families in the United States, including an estimated 15,000,000 persons, received some type of relief.⁴ The largest group consisted of persons receiving old-age assistance (over 2,000,000), closely followed by workers on WPA (1,860,000). The general relief cases were the third group in size (1,260,000). The southern states, however, accounted for less than one-tenth of all general relief cases in January, 1941, and in relation to the total population the figures for the southern states were far below those for other states with a large Negro population (Table 118). This serves to emphasize the well-known fact that the total number of cases receiving general relief is far lower than the number of families in need of such assistance.

Little comprehensive information on general relief since 1935 is available, and even the annual reports of the Departments of Public Welfare in most of the southern states fail to give data by race. The figures in Table 119, however, suggest that in large cities the proportion of Negroes receiving general relief exceeds their proportion in the total urban population but that the difference is smaller in the South than in the North. This is in accordance with the general pattern which prevailed during the FERA period. General relief in rural areas of the South is usually unimportant for Negroes and whites alike.

Not only general relief loads but also the size of general relief payments vary widely from one section of the country to another. While the average monthly relief benefit in most northern and border states with large Negro populations ranged around \$20 or more in January, 1941, only one state in the deep South paid as much as \$10

persons under 50 and employable childless couples under 50 off the public assistance rolls from May to September, 1939, because of exhaustion of funds (*Report of the Department of Public Welfare of the City of Baltimore, State of Maryland, Fifth Annual Report, 1939*, Baltimore, Md., pp. 23-24). According to information from the New Orleans Council of Social Agencies, there had been no appropriation up to the end of 1939 for aid to able-bodied adults who could not obtain federal work relief.

⁴Work relief, special types of public assistance, general relief, and Farm Security Administration subsistence grants. (See *Social Security Bulletin*, Vol. 4, April, 1941, p. 52.)

Table 118. - Cases Receiving General Relief, February, 1941, in Continental United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930 as Per Cent of All Occupied Dwelling Units, 1940

State	General relief cases, February 1941		State	General relief cases, February 1941	
	Number	As per cent of all occupied dwelling units, 1940		Number	As per cent of all occupied dwelling units, 1940
United States total	1,229,000 ^{a/}	3.5	Virginia	6,074	1.0
The North			West Virginia	12,131	2.7
New York	236,482 ^{b/}	6.5	North Carolina	5,644	0.7
New Jersey	37,294 ^{c/}	3.4	South Carolina	2,132	0.5
Pennsylvania	152,455	6.1	Georgia	6,473	0.9
Ohio	76,151	4.0	Florida	7,975	1.5
Indiana	43,227 ^{c/}	4.5	Kentucky	6,100 ^{d/}	0.9
Illinois	147,193	6.7	Tennessee	3,400 ^{d/}	0.5
Michigan	50,329	3.6	Alabama	2,356	0.3
Missouri	24,669	2.3	Mississippi	916	0.2
The South			Arkansas	4,392	1.0
Maryland	8,664	1.9	Louisiana	11,575	2.0
District of Columbia	2,157	1.2	Oklahoma	12,056 ^{e/}	2.0
			Texas	11,196	0.7

^{a/} Partly estimated.

^{b/} A few cases receiving medical care are included.

^{c/} Includes cases receiving medical care, hospitalization, and/or burial only.

^{d/} Estimated.

^{e/} Includes duplication.

Sources: Social Security Bulletin, May, 1941, p. 39; and Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series PB-3, No. 2.

Table 119.-Proportion of Negro Cases among All Cases on General Relief, 1939-40, and Proportion of Nonwhites in the Total Population, 1940, in Selected Cities

City	Period covered by relief data	Negro cases as per cent of all relief cases ^{a/}	Nonwhite population as per cent of total population, 1940
Chicago, Ill.	August -	44.9	8.3
Baltimore, Md.	September 1939	49.0	19.4
Atlanta, Ga.	May 1940	59.3 ^{b/}	34.5
New Orleans, La.	June 1939	56.2	30.2

a. Data for Atlanta and New Orleans include other nonwhites on relief.

b. Fulton County, Ga., rather than the city of Atlanta only.

Sources: Illinois Emergency Relief Commission, Illinois Persons on Relief - 1939, Release No. 6, Springfield, Ill., Summary No. 4; Report of the Department of Public Welfare of the City of Baltimore, State of Maryland, Fifth Annual Report, 1939, Baltimore, Md., p. 128; unpublished data from Georgia Department of Public Welfare and from Council of Social Agencies, New Orleans, La.; and Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary Releases, Series P-8, No. 10.

Table 120. - Average General Relief Benefits, January, 1941, in 41 States Combined and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930

State	Average general relief payment	State	Average general relief payment
41 states -----	<u>\$24.37</u>	Virginia -----	\$ 9.70
The North		West Virginia ----	8.93
New York -----	37.71	North Carolina ---	6.44
New Jersey -----	23.64	South Carolina ---	8.20
Pennsylvania -----	22.36	Georgia -----	6.52
Ohio -----	18.15	Florida -----	7.20
Indiana -----	14.40 ^{a/}	Kentucky -----	b/
Illinois -----	23.18	Tennessee -----	5/
Michigan -----	21.84	Alabama -----	8.94
Missouri -----	14.23	Mississippi ----	2.93
The South		Arkansas -----	5.72
Maryland -----	22.22	Louisiana -----	15.54
District of Columbia ----	24.87	Oklahoma -----	c/
		Texas -----	8.39

^{a/} Includes unknown number of cases receiving medical care, hospitalization, and/or burial only and total payments for these services.

^{b/} Data not available.

^{c/} Comparable data not available.

Source: Social Security Bulletin, April, 1941, p. 57.

(Table 120).⁵ As a result, assistance must often have been temporary and intermittent and supplementary to other inadequate resources or income.⁶ Where the grants of the southern states were continuous, they were low because of public policy and limited funds for general relief.

The scattered data available on average general relief benefits indicate that Negroes have received smaller grants than whites. Thus in New Orleans the average general relief benefit in June, 1939, was \$16.94 for colored cases and \$20.09 for white cases.⁷ The corresponding figures for Fulton County, Georgia, for May, 1940, were \$7.71 and \$9.48, respectively.⁸ Such data are in line with differences noted during the FERA period.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN KIND

If needy persons who are ineligible for, or fail to obtain, assistance from federal or federal-aided programs or who receive very low benefits had no other source of assistance than state or local general relief, their situation in the South, especially in rural areas, would be even more serious than it has been. The condition is partially ameliorated by the activities of the Federal Surplus Marketing Administration,⁹ which, in collaboration with other agencies, distributes large quantities of surplus commodities. These consist primarily of food-stuffs but also clothing, mattresses, and other household articles. Unfortunately, there are scarcely any data on the program by race so that the discussion must be limited to a short general description.

Distribution of surplus commodities has been effected through three main channels. The predominant method has been direct distribution of specific commodities stored in local warehouses to relief clients or to other needy persons selected by the local relief agencies. The Food Stamp Plan, inaugurated in May, 1939, operates through ordinary retail channels and represents a more rational attempt to increase the food consumption of low income groups, while not departing from the objective of helping farmers dispose of surplus products. The Cotton Stamp Plan, initiated in May, 1940, operated on the same general basis as the Food Stamp Plan. (This program

⁵ Louisiana averaged \$15.54.

⁶ See *Biennial Report for the State Department of Public Welfare, op. cit.*, for Virginia, p. 57, for a discussion of the problem.

⁷ Unpublished data, Georgia Department of Public Welfare.

⁸ Unpublished data, Council of Social Agencies, New Orleans, La.

⁹ The Federal Surplus Relief Corporation was organized in October, 1933. In November, 1935, its name was changed to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation. This latter agency came under the Surplus Marketing Administration as of June 30, 1940, and under the Agricultural Marketing Administration as of February 23, 1942.

was discontinued in 1942.) The third method for the distribution of surpluses—namely, the school-lunch program—was organized in co-operation with the Work Projects Administration and local authorities to provide free lunches to school children certified as in need. Other children may participate in the program for the payment of a small amount in so far as facilities permit.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, an average of 2,867,900 families, or 10,302,700 persons, in continental United States received surplus commodities under the program for direct distribution (Appendix table 67). Data are not available by race, and the proportion of the population receiving this type of assistance varied widely among the southern states. The number of recipients within a given state has fluctuated considerably not only from year to year but also from month to month. In Arkansas, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Oklahoma, however, more than one out of every ten persons in the total population was a member of families receiving surplus commodities in 1939-40. The majority of all recipients also received some other type of public assistance, but large numbers, particularly in the South, received surplus commodities only.¹⁰ This was probably especially true in those southern states in which the proportion of all persons receiving surplus commodities was high. The amount of food distributed during the year ending June 30, 1940, average approximately 600 pounds per family for the United States as a whole.¹¹ Foods distributed included fruits, vegetables, cereals, dairy products, shortening, sea food, sirup, eggs, and salt and smoked pork but not lean meats, so essential in a well-balanced diet. The foodstuffs did make possible considerable variety in the characteristic, monotonous, southern diet. The distribution of clothing, which averaged about two garments per family per month in North Carolina in 1939-40 but less than one garment per family per month in Mississippi in 1938-39 included such items as shirts, suits, dresses, coats, and underwear.¹² In addition, mattresses, pil-

¹⁰ According to local relief officers in Mississippi, there were no cases of direct cash relief in Coahoma County in January, 1940, and only 393 cases received aid to the aged or aid to the blind; but 3,200 families received surplus commodities. In Adams County the corresponding numbers of cases were 246 and 1,700, respectively.

¹¹ U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the Fiscal Year 1940*, Washington, 1940, p. 8.

¹² *Biennial Report of the North Carolina State Board of Charities and Public Welfare, July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1940*, Raleigh, N. C., pp. 157-159; and *Biennial Report of the Department of Public Welfare, State of Mississippi, for the Period July 1, 1937, through June 30, 1939*, Jackson, Miss., p. 36.

lows, sheets and pillow cases, towels, furniture, and other articles were distributed.

This form of surplus-commodity distribution certainly effects a considerable rise in the living conditions of relief clients, and it is, of course, much better than no assistance at all for needy families which do not receive any other aid. Its main function, however, is and should be to supplement other relief. Since it provides only for a certain number of items of consumption, it obviously cannot be adequate as a complete substitute for ordinary assistance. It may even be harmful when it provides an excuse for not giving other relief to families in great need.¹³ On the other hand, when the recipients have any cash income to speak of, regardless of whether from relief or other sources, the increase in the consumption of foodstuffs brought about by this distribution will be comparatively limited, for most of the recipients probably will increase their expenditures for other consumption items by a substantial part of the amount that the foodstuffs received represent. This endangers the two main objectives of the plan, which are to improve the balance between production and consumption of foodstuffs and to ameliorate the dietary conditions of needy families.

The Food Stamp Plan and the school-lunch program represent more rational attempts to attain these objectives. The Food Stamp Plan is so set up as to give relief recipients and other low-income families certified by local welfare agencies as eligible an added supply of certain surplus foods but only on the condition that they do not reduce their ordinary food purchases.¹⁴ Usually the family must purchase a minimum of \$1 up to a maximum of \$1.50 in orange stamps per person per week and then receives free of cost blue stamps for 50 per cent of this amount. The orange stamps can be used for the purchase, through ordinary retail channels, of any kind of food, whereas the blue stamps can be used only for commodities on a special list of surplus foodstuffs which is subject to change from time to time.¹⁵ By late 1940 the Food Stamp Plan was in operation in 275

¹³ Moreover, the method of distribution whereby the recipient is publicly given commodities and hence branded as a relief client has been sharply criticized. (See, for example, Josephine Chapin Brown, *Public Relief, 1929-1939*, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1940, p. 255.)

¹⁴ Norman Leon Gold, A. C. Hoffman, and Frederick V. Waugh, *Economic Analysis of the Food Stamp Plan*, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, 1940.

¹⁵ There is no guarantee, of course, that the food purchases of every participating family really are increased as a consequence of this scheme. Since per capita food expenditures even at a given income show great variations, there may be several relief families which ordinarily purchase foods for much greater amounts than

areas and reaching several million persons.¹⁶ Commodity distribution is discontinued where the Food Stamp Plan is in operation. While the Food Stamp Plan is constantly expanding, it has met certain difficulties in the South owing to the low relief benefits which make many relief clients unable to buy orange stamps in the designated amounts. Because of that it has been necessary to modify the plan in many cases so as to provide only for the gift of free blue stamps.¹⁷ The effect of the program on dietary inadequacies is suggested by the fact that the blue stamps are used largely for pork and pork products, eggs, and butter.

The Cotton Stamp Plan was not only more recent but also far more limited in scope. Under this program eligible needy families purchased stamps equal to about their usual expenditures for cotton goods within specified minimum and maximum limits and received an equal amount of free stamps. Goods and clothing so purchased had to be made from 100 per cent American cotton. One obvious result was to reduce the great unmet need for manufactured cotton products in the section of the country which produces the raw cotton.¹⁸

The school-lunch program, which depends upon federal surplus commodities, relief labor, and contributions and services from local sponsoring agencies, has met with spectacular success during the last few years. The peak number of schools in continental United States with lunch programs in operation during 1939-40 was 42,783 and the peak number of children served was 2,992,300 (Appendix table 68). The state (Oklahoma) with the most schools participating and the state (Georgia) with the most children receiving free lunches were both in the South. The rather rough indication of coverage given by the proportion the schools and children participating in the lunch program constituted of all public schools and children en-

they now have to invest in stamps. The gift of blue stamps, under such circumstances, will just enable them to use more purchasing power on other products than foodstuffs. Families which previously have purchased food for considerably less than \$1 per person per week may prefer not to participate at all. About three-fourths of the relief families which have been given the opportunity, however, do participate and also, by and large, their dietary standards have been improved. (See Norman Leon Gold, A. C. Hoffman, and Frederick V. Waugh, *op. cit.*, pp. 4 and 66-79.)

¹⁶ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Surplus Marketing Administration, *Eating the Surplus through the Food Stamp Plan*, Washington, March, 1941.

¹⁷ As of January, 1940, 22 per cent of the participants (mostly in the South) were given blue stamps free.

¹⁸ See U. S. Department of Agriculture, Surplus Marketing Administration, *Using Cotton Stamps under the Supplementary Cotton Program*, Washington, 1941.

rolled in public schools in 1935-36 indicates that the program was especially well developed in Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee, as well as Georgia and Oklahoma. The fact that the proportion of schools served usually exceeded the proportion of students suggests that the development of the program was greater among small rural schools than in the larger urban units.

Marked expansion of the program occurred during the school year 1940-41 with around 4,000,000 underfed children participating in the program early in 1941.¹⁹ No data are available on the extent to which Negro children were participants, but the more the program expands, especially in the South, the greater their participation, of course, becomes.

¹⁹ U. S. Department of Agriculture, Surplus Marketing Administration, *Summer Lunches for Hungry Children*, Washington, 1941. An extension of the program to provide summer lunches for children is also well under way.

Chapter XVII

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Soon after the inauguration of a large-scale federal relief program in 1933 it became evident that the needs of farm families, which remained on the land, were somewhat different from those of urban relief clients, as the farm families had at least the potential means of supplying part of their subsistence. Accordingly, a rural rehabilitation program was undertaken by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration in the spring of 1934 for the purpose of assisting "destitute farm families and other families residing in rural areas to become self-supporting and independent of emergency relief aid."¹ In 1935 the rural rehabilitation program was transferred to the Resettlement Administration, which in turn was succeeded in 1937 by the Farm Security Administration.

At the present time the activities of the Farm Security Administration are centered in three major programs:

(1) A program of rural rehabilitation under which: (a) farmers handicapped by an uneconomic scheme of operations and unable to obtain adequate credit from any other source may obtain assistance in planning a better system of farming, and may, in addition, obtain small loans to enable them to put the plans in operation; (b) farmers overburdened with debt are helped to negotiate voluntary adjustments with their creditors; and (c) farm families in extreme distress, and without prospect of making a crop (as in drought or flood areas), may receive small grants for the purchase of food, clothing and essentials of life.

(2) A farm-purchase program under which tenants, sharecroppers, and farm laborers may receive loans for purchase and improvement of farms of their own.

(3) A rehabilitation project program under which the Farm Security Administration is administering . . . part-time farming, full-time farming, migratory labor, and suburban home projects.²

¹ *Monthly Report of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, May 1 through May 31, 1934*, Washington, p. 6.

² *Farm Security Administration, Report on Financial Status from Inception to June 30, 1939*, Issued Pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 150, Washington, p. 3.

Over the period of operation under the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, the Resettlement Administration, and the Farm Security Administration in succession, several important changes in the special program for needy farmers have occurred. Increasing emphasis has been placed on practicality of operation and sound financing as contrasted with the more experimental approach of the early rural rehabilitation and related programs. In order to meet the varied needs of the families cared for under the rural rehabilitation standard loan program, emergency³ and supplemental loans and emergency grants have been developed. Also the standard loan period, where necessary, has been extended to as much as ten years instead of the original five-year limit to conform to the possibilities of clients for making repayments.⁴ The selection of clients themselves has tended to become increasingly rigorous from the early days of the rural rehabilitation program when farmers on relief were transferred wholesale to the program to the present time when the capabilities of potential clients are carefully evaluated. Because the program involves repayments of loans so that clients who are "good risks" for rehabilitation are obviously desired, constant vigilance must be maintained to keep the selection of clients within the low-income levels for which the over-all program was designed.

In carrying out the primary objective of assisting as large a proportion as possible of low-income farm families to become self-maintaining through one or another of the aspects of the program specified above, numerous types of assistance, involving both general agricultural practices and special forms of help, are involved. Thus the "farm-and-home plan" is an integral part of the rural rehabilitation program and has been carried over to the tenant-purchase program. Prepared co-operatively by the farm family and the local FSA farm- and home-management supervisors, the plan involves balanced farm production to produce both for sale and for home consumption, steps for raising the family's level of living, soil-conservation practices, and the adoption of modern farming methods.⁵ The plan provides for home production not only of most of the family's food supply but also of feed for livestock. All income and expenses are estimated and the size of the loan is deter-

³ Loans made to prospective standard loan clients for whom standard farm- and home-management plans cannot be drawn up in time to meet their needs for seed, livestock feed, and other items, and loans to victims of floods, droughts, and other disasters.

⁴ The interest rate on standard loans is 5 per cent.

⁵ See Philip Brown, "Toward Farm Security," *The Agricultural Situation*, Vol. 24, June, 1940, pp. 13-14.

mined on the basis of the amount necessary to put the plan into operation. The supervisors continue to work with the families throughout the year, supplying practical information on modern farm and home methods.

Besides the rehabilitation loans, loans are available to individuals for participation in co-operatives and also to groups which want to purchase heavy farming equipment, purebred breeding stock, canning equipment, spraying equipment, veterinarian services, and other goods and services involved in more efficient farm living.

The tenure improvement program is helping both FSA clients and other farmers to obtain specifically worded written leases which encourage the tenant to protect the soil and improve the property. These replace the former oral, one-year agreements, and while often on an annual basis every effort is made to extend the written leases and so lead to more permanent and improved relationships between landlords and tenants.⁶

Farm debt adjustment, one of the important activities under the rural rehabilitation program, offers a method whereby both FSA clients and other farmers are assisted in making agreements with their creditors for scaling down debts, extending the period of repayment, reducing interest rates, and refinancing.

The medical-care program was undertaken because of the realization that families with health problems are poorer risks than families in good health. The program, which is organized on a county basis, stresses comprehensive medical services. It has had its greatest development in the South, where rural medical facilities are least adequate, but in spite of steady growth it still covers a relatively small proportion of the total number of rehabilitation clients.⁷ Negro clients are reported to participate to at least as great an extent as white clients in medical-care programs where they are available.

Education is also stressed by the FSA both directly and indirectly. School attendance of children is encouraged. Families are taught improved agricultural and household practices. In many cases clients who know only the practices involved in one-crop agriculture must be instructed in new agricultural methods in order successfully to practice diversified farming. Moreover, the keeping of farm and household records involves much instruction, particularly in the case of southern tenant families.

⁶ The Farm Security Administration is the only federal agency which has made a major effort in this direction.

⁷ Group medical-care programs were in effect in 200 counties in January, 1939, and in 675 counties by June 30, 1940. (See Office of the Chief Medical Officer of the Farm Security Administration, *Progress Reports*, Washington.)

These various activities of the Farm Security Administration have been mentioned because they are of particular significance for the Negro farm population. Since Negro farmers are disproportionately represented among low-income farmers, they are correspondingly more handicapped than whites in securing the benefits of other farm programs, which either through legislative restrictions or through administrative practices frequently are not available to the most needy groups.

STANDARD LOAN PROGRAM

The most extensive activity⁸ of the Farm Security Administration is the standard loan program.⁹ The administration has made a determined effort to have Negroes represented on the program¹⁰ to the same extent that they are represented among all farm families, and this has been achieved for the nation as a whole and for the South. During the four years 1936-39, 12.5 per cent of all rehabilitation loans were made to Negro farmers in comparison with the 12.6 per cent that colored operators constituted of all farm operators in 1935. Negroes are represented on FSA to the extent that they are represented among all farm families in every southern region except Region VI. This is an unsatisfactory measure of participa-

⁸ From 1935 to June 30, 1940, a total of 854,000 needy families had received rehabilitation loans, including both standard and emergency loans (*Report of the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration: 1940*, Washington, p. 8).

⁹ The following persons are eligible for standard rural rehabilitation loans: "Low-income farmers, including owner-operators, tenants, sharecroppers, and farm laborers who are (1) living on farms from which they derive the major portion of their livelihood; (2) temporarily living in towns and villages because of inability to remain on farms from which they previously derived the major portion of their livelihood; or (3) recently married young men who are sons of farm families and desire to engage in farming operations for a livelihood; or (4) accepted applicants for TP [Tenant Purchase] loans will be considered eligible for standard loans if they are: (A) In need of the supervised and financed farm and home management services of the FSA. (B) Unable to obtain adequate farm financing from agencies other than the FSA. (This provision does not apply to TP borrowers as it is deemed desirable that all financing for such borrowers be through the FSA.) (C) Willing to assume the obligations of selfhelp necessary to effect their rehabilitation and show evidence of acceptable industry, ability and managerial capacity to profit from farm and home management guidance and instructions as well as financing" (*Standard Rural Rehabilitation Loans, Criteria and County Office Routine*, FSA Instruction 731.1, October 25, 1938).

¹⁰ Farm Security Administration, Division of Information, *The Southern Negro on the Farm*, Washington, April 2, 1940. In 1935, 17 per cent of the clients accepted for standard rural rehabilitation loans were colored; in 1936, 13 per cent; in 1937, 9 per cent; in 1938, 11 per cent; and in 1939, 15 per cent. (For corresponding figures for the South, see Appendix table 3.) Negroes constitute at least 99 per cent of those families classified as colored (Farm Security Administration, Rural Rehabilitation Division, Planning and Control Section, Washington).

Table 121. - Active Standard Rural Rehabilitation Borrowers in 4 Southern Regions of the Farm Security Administration, by Race or Color, December 31, 1939

Region and state	All borrowers	White	Negro		Indian	Other	Per cent of farm operators in 1940 who were nonwhite
			Number	Percent of total			
Four southern regions	200,749	154,381	45,335	23	450	583	23
Region IV - - - - -	42,909	37,314	5,445	13	146	4	12
Kentucky - - - - -	9,614	9,390	224	2	-	-	2
North Carolina - - - - -	11,677	8,397	3,141	27	135	4	22
Tennessee - - - - -	6,774	6,398	375	6	1	-	11
Virginia - - - - -	7,920	6,248	1,662	21	10	-	20
West Virginia - - - - -	6,924	6,881	43	1	-	-	1
Region V - - - - -	67,925	45,997	21,819	32	89	20	31
Alabama - - - - -	23,181	14,558	8,573	37	88	12	32
Florida - - - - -	11,881	9,444	2,236	19	1	-	16
Georgia - - - - -	21,770	16,358	5,408	25	-	4	27
South Carolina - - - - -	11,293	5,667	5,602	50	-	4	45
Region VI - - - - -	47,351	34,248	13,039	28	59	5	42
Arkansas - - - - -	17,790	15,181	2,605	15	1	3	26
Louisiana - - - - -	12,181	7,325	4,849	40	5	2	40
Mississippi - - - - -	17,380	11,742	5,565	32	53	-	55
Region VIII - - - - -	42,564	36,822	5,032	12	156	554	11 ^{a/}
Oklahoma - - - - -	17,544	16,606	778	4	156	4	8
Texas - - - - -	25,020	20,216	4,254	17	-	550	13

^{a/} Includes counties in western Texas and Oklahoma which are in FSA Region XII.

Sources: Farm Security Administration, Rural Rehabilitation Division, Planning and Control Section, Washington, and Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Agriculture, State Reports, First Series.

tion, however, as the Farm Security Administration recognizes. Because Negroes are found in such large proportions among the low-income farmers¹¹ whom the program is designed to assist, the most satisfactory basis for evaluating their participation is the proportion they constitute of all low-income farmers. In terms of the estimated number of low-income farm families in 1935 in the states constituting the four southern regions of the Farm Security Administration, Negro families accounted for 37 per cent of such families in 1935 but for only 23 per cent of the active standard rural rehabilitation borrowers at the end of 1939 (Table 121). While more than one out of five needy white farm families was currently assisted by the program, only one out of nine of the comparable colored families was given such assistance (Table 122).

Table 122. - Low-income Farm Families (Estimated) *a/*, 1935, and Active Standard Rural Rehabilitation Borrowers, December 31, 1939, in 4 Southern Regions *b/* of the Farm Security Administration, by Color

Item	Total	Colored	White
Estimated low-income farm families	1,102,000	409,000	693,000
Active standard RR borrowers	200,749	46,368	154,381
Active standard RR borrowers as per cent of low income families	18	11	22

a/ Estimated on the basis of data from the Consumer Purchases Study, the 1935 Census of Agriculture, and the WPA Census of Workers on Relief.

b/ Includes Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Source: Farm Security Administration, Rural Rehabilitation Division, Planning and Control Section, Washington.

The racial differential is due in part to the fact that the applications of Negro farmers are usually passed on by white officials and hence bias must often operate against accepting Negroes as good prospects for rehabilitation. Also the greater handicaps of Negroes than whites in terms of their smaller acreages (Appendix table 69) and other assets, their lesser experience as independent farmers, and their more limited education must frequently make them appear to be poor risks for a program which is largely self-liquidating. That the racial discrepancy is not greater is the result of pressure exerted by the Washington and regional offices on the local offices to grant loans to needy farmers irrespective of color.¹²

¹¹ The Farm Security Administration includes in this group farm families receiving relief or with net nonrelief incomes of less than \$500.

¹² Farm Security Administration, Rural Rehabilitation Division, Planning and Control Section, Washington.

The trend over the short period that the rural rehabilitation program has been in operation, however, reveals little tendency for the representation of Negroes to increase. During the five-year period 1935-39 the annual proportion of colored farm families among all farm families accepted as standard rural rehabilitation borrowers in the four southern regions of the FSA fell within the narrow range of 20 to 25 per cent (Appendix table 70). In three of the four southern regions Negroes have just about held their own on the program while in Region VIII, consisting of most of Oklahoma and Texas, a sharp decline in acceptances of colored clients has occurred.

Loan advances to all active standard borrowers on the program in 1939 in Maryland, Missouri, and the states in the four southern regions of the FSA averaged \$606 for colored clients and \$659 for white clients (Table 123). In Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennes-

Table 123.- Loan Advances to All Active Standard Borrowers in the South, ^{a/} December 31, 1939, and Record of Repayments, by Color

Item	All borrowers	Colored	White
Average amount of loan advances	\$648	\$606	\$659
Average amount repaid	\$254	\$248	\$255
Per cent of loan advances repaid	39	41	39

^{a/} Includes Maryland, Missouri, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Source: Farm Security Administration, Rural Rehabilitation Division, Planning and Control Section, Washington.

see, Virginia, and Louisiana, average loan advances to colored borrowers were higher than those to white borrowers. In relation to their net worth at the time of acceptance (Table 124), colored borrowers received more substantial assistance than whites. Clearly the problem of the Negro farmer is one of obtaining acceptance for the program as there is relatively little difference by color in the loans made. Colored borrowers have a slightly better record of repayments than white borrowers, indicating that they are making at least as rapid progress as white farmers on the program. This is particularly significant in relation to their lower net incomes than whites since acceptance on the program.

Even more important in terms of the success of the program

than the record of repayments are the changes in income, net worth, and home production of clients (Table 124). The average annual net income of colored borrowers in the South increased 62 per cent from the year before acceptance to the 1939 crop year in comparison with an increase of only 48 per cent among white borrowers.¹⁸ This was partly due to the lower net incomes of Negro than white farmers before acceptance, however, as the actual amount of the increase was greater for whites. So far as the increase in average net worth is concerned, white borrowers made a considerably better showing than Negro borrowers. On the other hand, the low net incomes of colored borrowers before acceptance made it essential that emphasis be placed first on raising the level of living rather than on increasing net worth. This is indicated by the substantial increase among colored borrowers in the average value of home-use production, an increase between the year before acceptance and the 1939 crop year of 95 per cent in comparison with a 69 per cent increase among white borrowers. While the percentage increases are striking, the fact should not be lost sight of that, even with expert advice, the net incomes achieved by rehabilitation clients in 1939 were distressingly low. The differential between the incomes of white and colored families was almost as great proportionately in 1939 as in the year before acceptance on the program. Moreover, while data on net cash income are not available, it is obvious that home-use production accounted for such a large proportion of the net income that the average family had little cash income to show for the year's work, apparently an average of less than \$100 on the part of colored clients.

While the income level is still low, the general financial picture indicates rapid advances by colored borrowers in comparison with status before acceptance. In addition to financial gains the clients have had the advantages of the various services which the program makes available in the effort to help them achieve permanent rehabilitation. Moreover, in those counties in which there are large numbers of Negro clients, an effort is made to employ Negro farm- and home-management supervisors to work with them although the number of such supervisors is still extremely small so that most Negro clients have white supervisors. Interesting in this connection is the fact that, in spite of the inadequate supervisory staff in terms of caseloads, in every southern state except Florida and Texas Negro borrowers received as many supervisory visits in 1939 as

¹⁸ The increase among both colored and white borrowers in the South exceeded the increase for all borrowers in the United States, which averaged 43 per cent.

Table 124. - Summary of Rehabilitation Progress of Active Standard Borrowers in the South, ^{a/} by Color

Item	All borrowers	Colored	White
Average annual net income			
Year before acceptance	\$301	\$208	\$326
1939 crop year	\$453	\$337	\$483
Increase since acceptance			
Amount	\$152	\$129	\$157
Per cent.	50	62	48
Average net worth			
At time of acceptance	\$689	\$414	\$762
On December 31, 1939	\$874	\$488	\$976
Increase since acceptance			
Amount	\$185	\$ 74	\$214
Per cent.	27	18	28
Average gross cash income			
Year before acceptance	\$310	\$223	\$333
1939 crop year	\$394	\$258	\$429
Increase since acceptance			
Amount	\$ 84	\$ 35	\$ 96
Per cent.	27	16	29
Average value of home-use production			
Year before acceptance	\$155	\$124	\$163
1939 crop year	\$268	\$242	\$275
Increase since acceptance			
Amount	\$113	\$118	\$112
Per cent.	73	95	69
As per cent of gross income			
Year before acceptance	33	26	33
1939 crop year	40	48	39

^{a/} Includes Maryland, Missouri, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Source: Farm Security Administration, Rural Rehabilitation Division, Planning and Control Section, Washington.

white clients or more.¹⁴ They are generally acknowledged to be easier to work with than white clients and to accept supervision more readily.

Data are not available on the extent to which Negro farmers have improved their tenure status as a result of participation in the standard loan program. About 30 per cent of all borrowers have been helped to advance from the status of sharecropper to that of tenant.¹⁵ As of December 31, 1939, only from 1 to 6 per cent of the clients in any region still had sharecropper or laborer status,¹⁶ practically all of whom were sharecroppers rather than laborers. That this was the result of tenure improvement is clearly seen from sample data showing that 14 to 26 per cent of all nonwhite clients and 11 to 29 per cent of all white clients in the four southern FSA regions were sharecroppers or farm laborers the year before they came on the program (Appendix table 71). Thus it is obvious that the status of most Negroes on the rural rehabilitation program has become that of either full or part owners or tenants. Tenure improvement is, of course, an essential part of the rehabilitation program.

Achievements to date offer objective evidence of the value of the program to Negro and white farm families alike. In view of the large number of eligible families still uncared for, however, the problems of expansion are particularly serious. Not only are the funds allocated inadequate to meet the need but also it is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain suitable farm land for both owner and tenant clients as more and more farm families are granted loans. It is often particularly difficult for Negroes to obtain land in white areas. Other major difficulties are to work out farm plans adapted to the agricultural experience of the families which will provide adequate cash crops, to teach the clients how to care for livestock as an alternative source of income, and to arrange for between-season work to supplement farm incomes.

GRANT PROGRAM

The grant program of the Farm Security Administration has provided assistance both for needy farm families ineligible for loans and for borrowers in need of supplementary assistance. Colored borrowers in the South have rather consistently received

¹⁴ Farm Security Administration, Rural Rehabilitation Division, Planning and Control Section, Washington.

¹⁵ *Report of the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration: 1940*, Washington, p. 12.

¹⁶ Farm Security Administration, Rural Rehabilitation Division, Planning and Control Section, Washington.

smaller grants than white borrowers. The average amount of grant payments received by active standard borrowers on the program in 1939 was \$29 for colored borrowers and \$35 for white borrowers.¹⁷ Only in North Carolina, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Oklahoma did colored borrowers receive larger average grants than whites.

Actually the grant program has been less important in the South than in drought areas and areas of other special disasters.

TENANT-PURCHASE PROGRAM

Because of growing alarm over the extent of farm tenancy, the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act was passed by Congress in 1937, authorizing the Farm Security Administration to make loans to tenant, sharecropper, and farm laborer families for the purpose of becoming owners of family-sized farms.¹⁸ The loans are available only to farmers in specifically designated counties¹⁹ who have no other sources of credit. Preference is given to those who can make a down payment or who own livestock and equipment and who have demonstrated managerial ability. Here, again, the Negro faces handicaps as the program is quite limited, large numbers of applications being received for each loan made, and his application must be passed upon by a local committee of white farmers. At the same time he is less likely than white applicants to have assets or to have demonstrated managerial ability. On the other hand, since the Act provided that the funds should be allocated on the basis of farm population and extent of tenancy, most of the loans are made in the South.

Farmers securing tenant-purchase loans not only acquire land but also build homes or improve existing ones. Like rural rehabilitation clients they have the benefit of sound farm management advice and work out farm plans providing for home production of food and feed, diversification of crops, and soil conservation.²⁰

From its inception in 1937 until June 30, 1940, 1,919 Negro

¹⁷ Farm Security Administration, Rural Rehabilitation Division, Planning and Control Section, Washington.

¹⁸ "The chief differences between the tenant-purchase program and rehabilitation are: (1) The idea of making loans for equipment is extended to include the farm itself, as the most important item of equipment needed for security; (2) because the loans are larger, the qualifications for borrowers are more exacting; and (3) since the tenant-purchase borrower has permanent possession of his farm, he can plan long-range improvements which are not possible for the renter who may have to move within a year or two" (*Report of the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration: 1939*, Washington, p. 15).

¹⁹ Selected on the basis of such factors as farm population, prevalence of tenancy, and availability of satisfactory farms at reasonable prices.

²⁰ Farm Security Administration, *Security for Farm Tenants*, Washington, 1940, *passim*.

Table 125. - Tenant-purchase Borrowers, by Color, 1937-June 30, 1940

Region and state	All borrowers, June 30, 1940	White		Negro		Per cent Negro borrowers, 1937 - 39	Negroes as per cent of all tenants, 1935
		Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent		
Four southern regions.....	8,985 ^{a/}	7,066		1,919	21.4	21.7	35
Region IV.....	1,805 ^{b/}	1,607		196	10.9	13.7	20
Kentucky.....	255	250		5	2.0	1.9	4
North Carolina.....	708 ^{c/}	585		122	17.2	22.0	35
Tennessee.....	481	449		32	6.7	9.5	21
Virginia.....	265 ^{c/}	228		36	13.6	16.7	27
West Virginia.....	96	95		1	1.0	0.0	1
Region V.....	3,161	2,314		847	26.8	27.2	44
Alabama.....	1,115	789		326	29.2	30.0	43
Florida.....	114	101		13	11.4	13.4	29
Georgia.....	1,203	888		315	26.2	26.4	38
South Carolina.....	729	536		193	26.5	26.3	57
Region VI.....	2,530	1,862		668	26.4	26.5	56
Arkansas.....	826	680		146	17.7	14.4	39
Louisiana.....	538	382		156	29.0	28.7	55
Mississippi.....	1,166	800		366	31.4	33.9	68
Region VIII.....	1,492 ^{c/}	1,283		208	13.9	13.1	15
Oklahoma.....	501 ^{c/}	454		46	9.2	9.6	8
Texas.....	991	829		162	16.3	15.0	18

^{a/} Includes three Indians.^{b/} Includes two Indians.^{c/} Includes one Indian.

Source: Farm Security Administration, Washington.

families in the South had been accepted on the program (Table 125). They constituted 21 per cent of all borrowers in the four southern regions of the FSA in comparison with the 35 per cent Negro tenants constituted of all tenants in 1935. Only in the parts of Oklahoma and Texas included in Region VIII did the proportion of Negroes obtaining loans approximate their proportion among all tenants.

Negroes have rapidly learned of the program and its advantages. During the fiscal year 1939 there were five times as many Negro applicants in the fourteen southern states as during the preceding year. In those states Negroes constituted 27 per cent of the applicants for the year ending June 30, 1939, and 23 per cent of the recipients of loans.²¹ In the preceding year Negroes obtained 18.6 per cent of the loans made in southern states.²² Although the program is so small under the present setup that it will not appreciably affect the number of farm tenants, it is important for the individual Negro because it provides a means of acquiring ownership of a family-sized farm.

REHABILITATION PROJECT PROGRAM

The Farm Security Administration fell heir to a considerable number of resettlement projects.²³ As of June 30, 1940, it was managing 164 homestead projects of various types. Developed as another way in which to assist needy farm families to attain security, they have also been used for experiments in farm management, in co-operative economic organization, in agricultural practices, etc. The various projects include farms scattered over three or four counties, farms in close proximity, and subsistence homesteads near industrial centers which provide seasonal employment.²⁴ Most of the projects in the South are agricultural projects, largely for full-time farmers, for whom the Farm Security Administration provides technical farm advice. In June, 1940, almost 1,400 Negro families were living on 32 homestead projects in thirteen southern

²¹ *Report of the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration: 1939*, Washington, p. 15.

²² Farm Security Administration, Division of Information, *The Southern Negro on the Farm*, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

²³ These were initiated by the Division of Subsistence Homesteads established in August, 1933, in the Department of the Interior. Additional projects were developed by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and the Resettlement Administration (*First Annual Report, Resettlement Administration*, Washington, 1936, p. 35).

²⁴ *Report of the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration: 1940*, Washington, pp. 13-15.

states (Appendix table 72). Eight of the projects were all Negro projects, while all of the remainder except one included both Negro and white families and this one was expected to include Negro families eventually. Negroes constituted about one-fourth of all families on the homestead projects, a proportion considerably below their representation among all low-income farm families. (See Table 122.) Unlike the standard loan program and the tenant-purchase program, there is relatively little emphasis on the expansion of homestead projects.

Rental co-operatives are a new development, the first co-operative having been established in 1939. By June, 1940, they were in operation in only three states, but the program is being expanded (Appendix table 73). The 548 Negro families on the program in 1940 constituted almost half of the total families in rental co-operatives. This type of project is particularly significant for the Negro because of the opportunity it affords for the development of Negro leaders.

The migratory labor camps also constitute an expanding service. While the Farm Security Administration rural rehabilitation program is designed to curtail excessive rural migration, steps were taken as early as March, 1936, to improve the living conditions of migrant families through building camps, providing cash and commodity grants, and arranging for medical services.²⁵ By June 30, 1940, 40 permanent camps and 16 mobile camps had been established, primarily on the Pacific coast.²⁶ A migratory labor camp for Negroes, however, was established at Belle Glade, Florida, and by June, 1940, was accommodating 150 families with a planned capacity of 358 families.²⁷ Looking toward the expansion of this program, funds were appropriated during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, for 5 mobile camps in North Carolina and Virginia,²⁸ which would be primarily for Negro migratory laborers.

The national defense program impinges upon the Farm Security Administration program as upon various other types of assistance for low-income families. Negro clients are reported to have shown less tendency to give up their farms for industrial employment than white clients. The Farm Security Administration itself, while en-

²⁵ See Farm Security Administration, *Migrant Farm Labor . . . The Problem and Some Efforts to Meet It*, Washington, 1940.

²⁶ *Report of the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration: 1940*, Washington, p. 16.

²⁷ This is known as the Okeechobee Migratory Labor Camp. Farm Security Administration, Resettlement Division, Washington, June 14, 1940.

²⁸ To be ready for the 1942 crop season.

couraging its families to take advantage of defense work, has made a definite effort to keep them attached to their farms. The lesser opportunities for Negroes than whites in the defense program has been another factor contributing to their greater tendency to retain their hold on the land. From every approach it is evident that Negro farm families are taking advantage of the help afforded by the various programs of the Farm Security Administration.

Chapter XVIII

HOUSING POLICIES

Housing policies in operation in the United States were largely depression-born. Prior to the thirties only a few scattered attempts were made by public authorities to provide housing for families which could not afford decent living quarters in terms of the private residential market. Neither were there any substantial efforts on the part of co-operatives or of limited-dividend corporations in the housing field.¹ The Paul Laurence Dunbar Apartments in Harlem, built in 1928 by John D. Rockefeller, and the Michigan Boulevard Garden Apartments in Chicago, which were financed primarily by Julius Rosenwald and were finished in the summer of 1929, constituted two of the few projects designed to improve the housing of Negroes.

Housing credit was organized almost entirely by private institutions, which were not only numerous and heterogeneous but also so unintegrated that little financial stability could be brought about. Moreover, interest rates were often much higher than would have been necessary with more adequate organization. There were few attempts to regulate real-estate speculation. The idea, for example, that municipalities could buy vacant land in order to control the development of new residential areas was foreign to the American mind. The situation was further complicated by high property taxes; and where corruption prevailed in municipal affairs, it often contributed to raising expenses for housing for the ultimate consumer. Public administration, in other words, had certain negative effects on housing conditions, and the balance between these negative effects and the positive effects was certainly not favorable for the consumer at that time.

The almost complete breakdown in residential building construc-

¹ It has been estimated that before the period of public housing subsidies not more than \$80,000,000 was invested in model tenements in the whole country (James Ford and Others, *Slums and Housing*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1936, p. 688).

tion during the early thirties,² which, of course, tended to make housing conditions still less satisfactory, helped to pave the way for the new housing policies. There were two main factors in the depression which brought about the developments advocated by specialists in the field of public housing. One was the extensive unemployment. It made the deficiencies in housing conditions appear even more paradoxical than before; or, rather, unemployment seemed to be the more absurd in view of the large amount of construction work that apparently needed to be done. The other aspect of the depression which contributed to the development of public housing was the financial collapse itself. Homeowners lost their homes in large numbers, apartment houses had to be given up, and banks, mortgage companies, building and loan associations, and other financial associations began to fail at a rapid rate. Conditions were such that it was necessary for the government to take specific steps. The task was enormous, and the work that was done changed the whole pattern of housing credit.

Recent housing policies have two main aspects. In the first place there is the substantial reform in the credit system. It has not involved any elements of subvention except, particularly in the beginning, for administrative purposes or because of financial losses necessary in order to stop a threatening breakdown of homeownership. Otherwise the question has been one of more adequate organization. This activity could not solve the housing problem for families unable to purchase adequate housing facilities even under ideal circumstances in the credit and building market, but it could solve it for millions of others. Moreover, the financial reorganization tended to have a broader effect than merely better credit conditions. In many instances a new element of planning was introduced.

The other aspect of the housing policies was the development of housing projects for that ill-housed third of the nation which under no conditions could be given adequate aid on regular business terms. This program involved substantial governmental aid. The number of dwellings constructed with these subsidies was, of course, smaller than the number of new units financed through the participation of federal agencies on a regular business basis. Moreover, they were located primarily in urban areas as public housing projects in rural areas are still of limited significance from the quantitative point of view.

² Federal Home Loan Bank Board, *Eighth Annual Report* for the period July 1, 1939, through June 30, 1940, Washington, p. 3.

, ACTIVITIES OF HOUSING AGENCIES

In 1933 the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was organized in order to rescue small homeowners who were in default and threatened with the loss of their properties. Until June, 1936, when this federal agency ceased to take on any new business and continued only for the purpose of liquidation of properties on hand, more than 1,000,000 small homes, or about 10 per cent of the total number of nonfarm owned homes in 1930, were refinanced by the agency, and the total amount of loans exceeded \$3,000,000,000.³ Almost one-fifth of this amount was invested in the three southern census divisions. This corresponds roughly to the proportion of nonfarm owned homes which were located in the South.⁴ The amortization period was originally 15 years but may now be extended to 25 years. The interest rate on original contracts was 5 per cent, but in 1939 an adjustment down to 4.5 per cent was made.⁵ In view of the fact that these activities have been concentrated on properties which, at least at the time of the depression, were not attractive for private investment, it is quite explainable that considerable losses have occurred in a great number of cases. The net number of foreclosures which were authorized by the Corporation by June, 1940, was 182,000.⁶ Over 100,000 properties acquired by the Corporation had been sold at a total net loss of about \$112,000,000,⁷ but the Corporation has certain income and reserves which may compensate for these losses.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation is directed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. This institution also supervises the 12 Federal Home Loan Banks which have been operating since 1932.

The main purpose of this system is to serve as financial backing for the building and loan associations, which are now usually referred to as savings and loan associations. Although only one-half of the 8,000 savings and loan associations in 1939 were members of the system, these members were responsible for over \$3,000,000,000 of mortgage credit or more than three-fourths of the total amount held by savings and loan associations.⁸

Probably even more important, however, is the Federal Housing

³ Federal Home Loan Bank Board, *Seventh Annual Report* for the period July 11, 1938, through June 30, 1939, Washington, p. 125.

⁴ *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1938*, pp. 51 and 264.

⁵ Federal Home Loan Bank Board, *Eighth Annual Report*, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 236.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

Administration, which during the years 1934-40 insured mortgages for a total of \$4,400,000,000. Over one-fifth of this amount was for properties in the South, which corresponded to this region's share in the total number of nonfarm homes.⁹ The bulk of the insurance has been for new single-family homes. During the whole period 1935-40 almost half a million single-family homes were built with FHA backing.¹⁰ During 1940 not less than 40 per cent of the estimated total nonfarm construction of such dwellings in the United States had FHA-insured mortgages. This is the more remarkable in view of the fact that over three-fourths of all dwelling units built in nonfarm areas during this year were single-family houses.¹¹ A considerable part of the FHA insurance refers to existing homes, most of which have been improved or repaired.¹² The insurance written by FHA for mortgages on new rental projects, on the other hand, is comparatively insignificant; 32,000 dwelling units were involved during the period 1935-40.¹³

Statistical data, however, do not give a full account of the significance of the activities of the Federal Housing Administration. Although this agency does not itself give housing credit but merely insures credit given by other financial institutions, such as banks, mortgage companies, savings and loan associations, and insurance companies, it is evident that acceptance of the financial risk forces the agency to assume considerable responsibility for developments in the housing field. This responsibility refers not only to the individual house; the fact that the FHA activities are on such a large scale also makes necessary a certain emphasis on problems of planning. This is true, for example, in the case of new subdivisions. The FHA does not formally assume leadership in this field, but it is quite natural that realtors and financial institutions which want to secure FHA backing are apt to follow suggestions from this agency.¹⁴

⁹ Federal Housing Administration, *Seventh Annual Report* for the year ending December 31, 1940, Washington, p. 8; and *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1938*, pp. 51 and 53.

¹⁰ Federal Housing Administration, *Seventh Annual Report*, *op. cit.*, pp. 61 and 70.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 29 and 61.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

¹⁴ "The steadily increasing reliance of the home building industry upon the neighborhood-planning principles fostered by the Administration since the start of the FHA program was reflected during 1940 by the fact that in some cities approximately 70 per cent of the new homes financed under the FHA plan were located in new subdivisions planned and developed from the beginning in cooperation with the FHA" (*Ibid.*, p. 22). (See also *Successful Subdivisions*, Federal Housing Ad-

There are no data on the extent to which the Negro has benefited from the activities of these federal financial institutions. It can be taken for granted, however, that the Negro's share in all cases has been smaller than the corresponding proportion of Negroes in the population and still smaller than his relative need of better housing conditions. This is only natural since these financial agencies, except for the financial losses which the Home Owners' Loan Corporation found it necessary to face, are organized on the basis of ordinary business principles and consequently have to consider the purchasing power of the patrons. It should be emphasized, however, that highly commendable and successful efforts have been made to reach as low down on the income scale as is compatible with the no-subsidy principle. The FHA writes insurance only on single first mortgages. The median percentage that these mortgages constituted of the total property valuation in 1940 of new and existing one- to four-family homes was 87 per cent.¹⁵ The interest rates on such mortgages may not exceed 4.5 per cent and in many cases are even lower.¹⁶ Since the insurance premium amounts to only one-half of one per cent,¹⁷ and the mortgages in most of these cases have a duration of 20 to 25 years,¹⁸ it is possible to keep the monthly payments well within the reach of families with moderate means. The median income for the largest group of borrowers on new single-family homes in 1940 was \$2,381. It should be particularly noted that this figure has been constantly decreasing; in 1936 it was \$2,814.¹⁹ Even so, however, since only 29 per cent of these borrowers in 1940 had incomes of less than \$2,000 and but 5 per cent had incomes of less than \$1,500, it is quite apparent that only a small minority within the Negro population is financially able to buy FHA homes.²⁰

Furthermore, the emphasis on ordinary business principles by federal housing agencies has the effect of encouraging segregation. The agencies have been organized for the purpose of assisting private financial institutions to bring about better integration and more stability in the field of housing credit. One of their main interests must be to protect real-property values. Rightly or wrongly, the

ministration, Planning Bulletin No. 1, and National Association of Housing Officials, *Housing Yearbook, 1940*, pp. 161-162.)

¹⁵ Federal Housing Administration, *Seventh Annual Report*, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁷ *Idem.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

²⁰ See Chapter V.

Negro has always been regarded as a menace to real-estate values. From this approach the housing of Negroes presents a problem against which adequate protection must be organized.

The *Underwriting Manual* of the Federal Housing Administration contains instructions and regulations to be followed by underwriting staffs of the Federal Housing Administration.²¹ It lists "protection from adverse influences" as one of the features to be rated in order to determine eligibility for a loan from the agency.

This feature has a total weight of 20 points, which indicates it is one of the most important features in the Rating of Location. . . . Where little or no protection is provided from adverse influences, the Valuator *must not hesitate to make a reject rating of this feature.*²²

Such protection may take the form of zoning ordinances, restrictive covenants, natural physical protection, the quality and homogeneity of surrounding neighborhoods, and so forth. While the *Manual* is careful not to refer to Negroes as an adverse influence, the discussion of natural physical protection contains the statement that "protection from adverse influences . . . includes prevention of the infiltration of business and industrial uses, lower class occupancy, and inharmonious racial groups."²³

Even greater emphasis is placed upon these considerations in the case of undeveloped or other sparsely developed areas:

The Valuator should realize that the need for protection from adverse influences is greater in an undeveloped or partially developed area than in any other type of neighborhood. Generally, a high rating should be given only where adequate and enforced zoning regulations exist or where effective restrictive covenants are recorded against the entire tract, since these provide the surest protection against undesirable encroachment and inharmonious use. To be most effective, deed restrictions should be imposed upon all land in the immediate environment of the subject location. . . .

Recommended restrictions should include provisions for the following: . . .

g. Prohibition of the occupancy of properties except by the race for which they are intended.²⁴

The significance of this is the greater since the Federal Housing Administration has introduced a new element of integrated plan-

²¹ Federal Housing Administration, *Underwriting Manual*, Washington, 1938.

²² *Ibid.*, par. 932; our italics.

²³ *Ibid.*, par. 935.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, par. 980.

ning into new residential areas. There are few data on the earlier prevalence of restrictive covenants with racial clauses, but the fact that there was little large-scale planning makes it more likely than not that practices in this respect lacked uniformity and that even new houses were by no means completely covered by such covenants. The fact that the Federal Housing Administration, as the easiest way out of an otherwise extremely complicated dilemma, has sided with the segregationists may tend to make urban Negroes more restricted in their residential areas than they were before.

Complete housing segregation, however, if it is made mainly negative, is impossible. Certain areas cannot be kept free from Negroes in the long run unless there is a plan for giving Negroes so much new space that the intensive cityward Negro migration can be taken care of and the pressure on white areas thereby removed. The Federal Housing Administration, for previously cited reasons, has apparently not been able to carry out extensive plans of this kind,²⁵ even though it undoubtedly has been of assistance to several thousand Negro families.

SUBSIDIZED HOUSING

The building of subsidized housing projects constitutes the most controversial aspect of housing policies. Many persons accept as a primary value premise that governmental interference in housing should be restricted to planning and organization and that outright subsidies either should not be permitted at all, except for the housing of certain institutionalized groups, or should be used only on a limited scale for the purpose of experimentation whereby private investors could be taught how to build for low-income groups. This value premise cannot be criticized as such. If, however, any attempt is made to rationalize it by statements to the effect that adequate housing can be provided for all low-income families without any kind of subsidies paid either by housing agencies or by general welfare agencies which co-operate with the housing agencies, it is easy to cite income statistics which indicate that such statements lack factual content. This is particularly true in the case of the Negro.

The Negro is represented in subsidized housing projects to a much greater extent than in the general population. This compen-

²⁵ It may be of some significance that the Federal Housing Administration, unlike the United States Housing Authority, does not have any division of race relations, which could serve as spokesman for Negro interests within the agency.

sates in some measure for the fact that he has not received his proportionate share of other governmental housing activities. The subsidized housing projects in many cases have opened up new areas for Negroes, for a considerable part of them have been located on vacant land. Even in those sections of the country in which Negro areas otherwise are habitually more or less neglected, there are paved streets around the new projects and the utility equipment is complete. Thus there often is a chance of comparatively good private housing developments for Negroes in the neighborhood of projects which are located on vacant land. The main purpose of the housing projects, however, is to provide adequate accommodation for a certain number of ill-housed, low-income families and not to open up new outlets for overcrowded population groups. More than half of all USHA projects are located on old slum sites.²⁶ The Negro, by and large, is treated as one low-income group among others, and there is no general provision for his special need of more space on account of previous segregative factors.

During the period 1933-37 the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration built 21,319 dwelling units in 49 projects located in 36 cities; 14 of these projects were for Negro occupancy and 17 for joint Negro-white occupancy. The number of dwelling units for Negroes was 7,507 or a little more than one-third of the total. Scarcely half of these units were in the seventeen southern states.²⁷

In spite of the fact that 45 per cent of the cost of the projects represented direct government grants, and the net income consequently was supposed to cover amortization and interest only on the remaining 55 per cent,²⁸ rents were so high that those who suffered most could seldom afford to live in the projects. The average rental (including utilities) for an apartment of 3.6 rooms in 1939 was over \$24 a month—representing 24 per cent of the mean income of the families housed, which was slightly over \$1,200 a year.²⁹ The mean income for Negro-occupied projects was somewhat lower or roughly \$1,000 a year, but even this figure indicates that it was mainly the middle-class and better working-class Negroes who could afford to live in these dwelling units. Another indication that the projects failed to reach those who were suffering most is that

²⁶ Federal Works Agency, *First Annual Report, 1940*, Washington, p. 179.

²⁷ *Annual Report of the United States Housing Authority, 1939*, Washington, pp. 44-45.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

the average family size was only 3.31; it was still lower for Negro projects.⁸⁰

A new program under the direction of the United States Housing Authority was instituted in 1937. This agency does not, as did the PWA Housing Division, carry on any construction work itself. Its function is to aid local housing authorities by financial assistance (credit and subsidies) and supervision. The local authority can borrow up to 90 per cent of the total approved costs from the federal agency and the remainder from other sources. In order to render it possible for the local authorities to keep the rents at a level within the reach of a low-income clientele, the federal agency furthermore gives substantial annual contributions or grants-in-aid on the condition that the local community also pays certain subsidies, which usually take the form of tax exemptions.⁸¹

By July 31, 1941, the number of dwelling units in USHA housing projects under loan contract was 176,000, of which an estimated 106,000 or 60.4 per cent were for white tenants and 53,000 or 30.2 per cent for Negro tenants, 6,000 for Puerto Ricans, 5,000 for Latin Americans, 1,000 for Hawaiians, Chinese, Japanese, and others, and the remainder for rural tenants of unknown race.⁸² These data, however, include not only projects already completed but also those under construction or only planned.⁸³ Regional distribution figures, which are somewhat lower since they are based on earlier information (Table 126), indicate that in the three major

⁸⁰ The PWA housing projects are now administered by the United States Housing Authority or by local housing authorities which work together with this federal agency. In accordance with the principles which govern the activities of this setup, rentals are gradually reduced and the projects are made available to families with somewhat lower incomes.

⁸¹ The annual federal contributions up to 1940 averaged around 3.5 per cent of the property values, but experiences from new projects indicate a trend downward to an average of about 2.8 per cent (United States Housing Authority, *What Does the Housing Program Cost?*, Washington, 1940, p. 8). This, however, is only the gross contribution. The USHA charges the local authorities interest rates which, according to the experiences at the beginning of 1940, exceeded those paid by the agency itself by 15½ per cent (*Ibid.*, p. 15). Part of this difference may be chargeable to risk and administration costs connected with the credit operations; but another part can be regarded as profit, which reduces the net value of the federal contribution. The local subsidies must amount to at least 20 per cent of the federal gross contributions and have in reality been averaging about 50 per cent of those amounts (*Ibid.*, p. 10).

⁸² Tabulation by the Office of Racial Relations, United States Housing Authority, Washington, August 15, 1941.

⁸³ The corresponding total for June 30, 1940, was 146,000 dwelling units, of which 85,000 were in projects under construction or completed, and only 12,000 were actually occupied (Federal Works Agency, *First Annual Report, 1940, op. cit.*, p. 162).

Table 126.- Urban Dwelling Units in United States Housing Authority-aided Projects under Loan Contract, Estimated Racial Occupancy, May, 1940, and Urban Families in the United States, 1930, by Race

Section	Urban dwelling units in USHA - aided projects ^{a/}				Urban families in the United States, 1930 ^{b/}			
	All races		Negro		All races		Negro	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
United States - - - -	139,144	100.0	47,727	100.0	17,372,524	100.0	1,328,170	100.0
The North - - - - -	75,222	54.1	18,820	39.4	12,186,406	70.1	514,187	38.7
The South - - - - -	54,566	39.2	28,906	58.7	3,211,382	18.5	785,189	59.1
The West - - - - -	9,356	6.7	901	1.9	1,974,736	11.4	28,794	2.2

^{a/} List of urban dwelling units in USHA-aided projects under loan contract in 32 states and the District of Columbia, provided by the Office of Racial Relations, United States Housing Authority, Washington, D. C.

^{b/} Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population, Vol. VI, United States Summary, Table 42 and State table 4.

geographical sections the number of dwelling units intended for Negroes corresponded to between 3 and 4 per cent of the total number of Negro urban families in 1930, whereas the proportions for non-Negroes were about 1 per cent in the South and 0.5 per cent in the North and the West. The fact that even southern Negroes received such a large share of these benefits indicates that the United States Housing Authority has been more successful than most other federal welfare agencies in overcoming local resistance in this respect. It should be remembered, however, that these activities so far are limited almost entirely to urban areas. The authorities in southern cities are generally much more apt to consider the Negro aspect of social-welfare problems than are the local authorities in the rural South.

The 139,000 dwelling units were located in some 380 different projects; 194 of these were for white occupants only, 133 for Negroes only, and 40 for both Negro and white occupants. The remainder were for Latin Americans, either alone or together with Negroes or whites.⁸⁴ In most of the cases in which both Negroes and whites live in the same projects, they are segregated in different wings. There are a few cases, however, particularly in New York City,⁸⁵ in which Negroes and whites live together without any kind of segregation. In spite of this, the USHA housing projects have, on the whole, strengthened rather than weakened housing segregation. In many cases this has certainly been necessary if the Negro was to receive any benefit at all from the program. In view of the fact that public opinion has always been divided on the value of the USHA plan, it is not even certain that the plan could have materialized at all (either for Negroes or for whites) had not the USHA followed the policy of adherence to local ideologies in this regard.

The total rent for the dwelling units in the USHA projects, including taxes and utilities, averages about \$35 a month. Because of the annual federal and local contributions, however, the tenant pays about 45 per cent less or approximately \$19 a month. Of this amount \$6 is a utility charge and about \$13 is shelter rent. There are significant local variations, however. The highest shelter rent recorded in June, 1940, was almost \$18, which was the average for two

⁸⁴ By July 31, 1941, there were 242 urban projects under loan contract which were intended for Negro or Negro-white occupancy. They were located in 174 cities in 33 states. In addition, there were 74 rural projects located in 8 states (Office of Racial Relations, United States Housing Authority, August 15, 1941).

⁸⁵ According to information from the New York Housing Authority, white tenants have as yet shown practically no signs of dissatisfaction because of this arrangement.

housing projects in Newark, New Jersey. At the other extreme was a Negro project in Miami, Florida, which succeeded in cutting down the monthly rent to little more than \$6. The average annual family income anticipated for families on all projects was \$787. The average family income for individual projects varied between \$1,110 and \$442.⁸⁶

Both rentals and incomes by and large tend to be lower in Negro than white projects. It is furthermore to be noted that there are variations within the individual projects, often even for families of the same size. The United States Housing Authority recommends a system of so-called graded rentals. Dwelling units of given size may, for instance, be classified by their desirability, but the rentals vary more than the quality and cost.⁸⁷ Large families, too, may be favored in a similar way.⁸⁸ Such devices may somewhat increase the possibilities of representation among families in particularly poor economic situations; but the services of entire projects cannot be directed toward such families, for if some tenants receive a larger share of the subsidies, others must receive less and, accordingly, pay higher rents than would otherwise be necessary. Thus everything goes to show that the housing projects to a large extent serve income groups somewhat above the lowest levels. The United States Housing Authority has even found it necessary to permit certain more or less unofficial income minima.⁸⁹ Relief families may be admitted at the discretion of the local authorities, but the United States Housing Authority apparently does not count on reaching relief families unless the assistance is "reasonably adequate."⁹⁰

It should be emphasized, furthermore, that, in spite of the fact that large families relatively more often than small ones are suffering from poor housing conditions, the former have scarcely received help in proportion to their greater need. The average family size for 64 projects on June 30, 1940, was 3.9, which is the same figure

⁸⁶ United States Housing Authority, *What Does the Housing Program Cost?*, Washington, pp. 12-13; and Federal Works Agency, *First Annual Report, 1940*, *op. cit.*, pp. 374-375.

⁸⁷ United States Housing Authority, Proposed revision of Bulletin No. 24, *Establishing Rent Schedules for U.S.H.A.-aided Projects*, Washington, p. 7.

⁸⁸ United States Housing Authority, *Initial Steps in Tenant Selection*, Bulletin No. 22, Washington, pp. 3-4.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁹⁰ "If local relief is adequate, an appropriate lower [income] limit will exclude very few families" (United States Housing Authority, Proposed revision of Bulletin No. 24, *op. cit.*, p. 6).

as for all urban families of two or more persons in 1930.⁴¹ The regulations on income maxima at time of admission provide another indication of the scant attention paid to the relation between family size and level of living. For 17 projects, for which income limits had been set at the end of 1939, the maximum income for the largest families was in most instances only about 40 per cent higher than the corresponding maximum for the smallest families admitted. In one case the difference was only 24 per cent.⁴² The difference in cost of living between a two-person family and a seven-person family certainly is greater than that.

Such limitations, especially the failure to reach the lowest income groups, are, of course, particularly significant in the case of the Negro. It can be taken for granted that a greater proportion of the Negro than the white population is cut off from the housing projects simply because of too great poverty. Even in the next-to-the-lowest income groups of the Negro population, on the other hand, the need for this housing aid is undoubtedly so extensive that the criticism should not be stressed too much. The housing agencies, finally, cannot accept all the blame for these conditions. Only through a more complete integration between their work and that of other welfare agencies will it ever become possible to solve the problem.⁴³

Another criticism against the present subsidized housing policies refers to the too close relationship between slum clearance and building of new projects. According to the housing act the same number of dwelling units has to be demolished, closed, or repaired as is provided for in the projects. Although such action may be deferred whenever there is a shortage of housing, the total number of dwelling units eliminated by June 30, 1940, was more than two and a half times greater than the number of units actually occupied in new projects.⁴⁴ Although the figure on elimination includes some repaired units,⁴⁵ it appears that this would indicate a temporary decrease in the supply of low-priced dwelling units. On the whole,

⁴¹ Federal Works Agency, *First Annual Report, 1940, op. cit.*, p. 374; and *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. VI*, p. 14. It should be noted that unattached individuals are not admitted to the housing projects.

⁴² *Annual Report of the United States Housing Authority, 1939, op. cit.*, pp. 1-2.

⁴³ This problem of integration is treated in *Housing and Welfare*, Report of a survey conducted by the United States Housing Authority, Federal Works Agency in co-operation with the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency, Washington, 1940.

⁴⁴ Federal Works Agency, *First Annual Report, 1940, op. cit.*, p. 162; and *Annual Report of the United States Housing Authority, 1939, op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-15.

it seems that the rational way to carry out elimination of slum dwellings would be to do it whenever the supply of low-cost housing is comparatively adequate, regardless of whether this is due to the previous building of subsidized projects or to other factors. To consider just one factor can very easily have unfortunate effects. Such effects appear especially when housing projects are built on slum sites, and it is quite probable that Negro slum dwellers are among those who suffer particularly great hardship during the period of construction. A considerable part of the families which have lived in the demolished slums never will be accepted as tenants in the housing projects. Some have incomes above the maximum or below the minimum limits. Others have a poor record as rent payers or for disorderly conduct. Unattached individuals are not admitted, and neither are those who intend to sublet to roomers and boarders.

A third criticism which has been directed against the subsidized housing projects is that so far they have housed only a handful of those suffering from poor housing conditions and that those have been selected in an arbitrary way so that actually there is almost more injustice than before. This criticism, however, has often been carried too far. Injustices of this kind are inevitable for the simple reason that this type of housing reform, even at best, requires several decades, and during this long transition period it is impossible to satisfy other than a more or less arbitrarily selected part of the total need. It cannot be denied, on the other hand, that there has been too little constructive discussion of future prospects. How could a more complete, long-range plan be developed out of these partly experimental attempts which, if they are not in some way continued, undoubtedly will be of little significance except for a small group of ex-slum dwellers? Will it ever be possible to provide adequate housing for all ill-housed, low-income families at a cost that can be considered? These problems undoubtedly are of even greater significance to the Negro than to other major population groups. His need for continued progress is more vital. Even his chance to leave the slums through individual social climbing is much smaller than that of other slum dwellers. The commendable attempts made so far may have given him a new hope, for the federal and local housing authorities have given him a larger share of the benefits than has any other major group of public-welfare agencies.

APPENDIXES

.....

Appendix A

SURVEYS OF FAMILY INCOMES AND EXPENDITURES

The most comprehensive survey to date of family incomes and expenditures in the United States is the Consumer Purchases Study conducted in 1935-36 as a Works Progress Administration project by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U. S. Department of Labor and the Bureau of Home Economics of the U. S. Department of Agriculture in co-operation with the National Resources Committee and the Central Statistical Board.¹ It covered a sample of some 300,000 farm, village, and city families in all occupational groups and at all income levels in the various geographical sections of the country. Income was defined to include the total net money income received during the year by all members of the economic family, plus the value of certain items of nonmoney income. It did not include direct relief in cash or in kind.

Over 25,000 Negro families were included in the sample, representing the following coverage in the South: 1 large city (Atlanta, Georgia), 2 middle-sized cities (Columbia, South Carolina, and Mobile, Alabama), 4 small cities, 34 villages, and 22 farm counties.² In only three northern

¹ The information obtained from each family covered a twelve-month period that ended sometime between December 31, 1935, and December 31, 1936. The results are available in bulletins issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and by the Bureau of Home Economics.

² The following small cities, villages, and farm counties were sampled in the South:

Small cities: Albany, Ga.; Gastonia, N. C.; Griffin, Ga.; Sumter, S. C.

Villages:

Georgia: Comer, Commerce, Greensboro, Jefferson, Madison, Social Circle, Washington, Winder.

Mississippi: Drew, Hollandale, Indianola, Itta Bena, Leland, Moorhead, Mound Bayou, Rosedale, Ruleville, Shaw, Shelby.

North Carolina: Elm City, Franklinton, Louisburg, Nashville, Spring Hope, Wake Forest, Whitakers, Zebulon.

South Carolina: Bishopville, Camden, Lake City, Lamar, Manning, Summerton, Timmons ville.

Farm counties (dominant type of farming indicated):

Georgia: Clarke, Elbert, Greene, Jackson,* Madison, Morgan, Oconee, Wilkes (cotton).

* Only white families were sampled.

communities (New York City; Chicago, Illinois; and Columbus, Ohio) were Negro families sampled in appreciable numbers.

The communities covered indicate that the Consumer Purchases Study was not fully representative of the general Negro population. The value of the northern sample of Negro families was particularly limited. Of the three northern cities only Columbus was represented by an appreciable absolute (2,161) and relative (27.0 per cent of the 1930 population) number of Negro families, whereas the New York and Chicago samples for Negroes (some 1,200 families in each case or roughly 2 per cent of the 1930 population) were much poorer.³ The southern sample of Negro families was not intended to cover more than the Southeastern Cotton and Tobacco Belt, and even in that respect the sample was more limited than would have been desirable. It is uncertain whether the data for the seven cities give a representative picture of conditions in the urban part of the Old Cotton Belt. The villages, on the other hand, should be numerous enough. The fact that the data indicate an even lower average income for Negro families in villages than on farms (see Table 27) may seem somewhat startling, but it may be largely explained on the ground that certain low income groups—i.e., agricultural wage laborers, farm operators or sharecroppers who had moved during the year, and totally unemployed families—were excluded from the farm sample.⁴ While these omissions were justified in terms of costs and administrative difficulties, all conclusions in regard to the general income structure of the Negro population have to be drawn with caution. The Consumer Purchases Study was not originally planned to make precise conclusions of this kind possible. What it does give, on the other hand, is a series of examples of the income conditions of Negroes in various types of communities and how they compare with those of white families. On this basis the data from the Consumer Purchases Study are adequate.⁵

This general conclusion is warranted by comparisons with data from other studies. Probably the best among these is the National Health

Mississippi: Bolivar,* Leflore, Sunflower,* Washington (cotton).

North Carolina: Jackson,* Macon* (self-sufficing).

North Carolina: Edgecombe, Nash (cotton and tobacco).

South Carolina: Clarendon,* Darlington, Florence, Lee,* Marion,* Sumter* (cotton and tobacco).

* Only white families were sampled.

³ In New York also the regular sample of native-born Negro and white families was taken in the so-called "native area"; i.e., census tracts in which one-third or more of the family heads in 1930 were native-born. At least in regard to whites this resulted in an overestimate of the income level.

⁴ In addition, broken families were excluded from both the farm and village samples and the New York sample. Also the number of counties surveyed was so small that accidental deviations from the general income pattern sometimes may have seriously affected the picture. The two counties in North Carolina in which both Negro and white families were sampled, for example, seem to show unusually high average incomes (Table 27).

⁵ The fact that families with particularly high incomes showed more reluctance to co-operate than other families and, therefore, are underrepresented scarcely affects the Negro sample.

Survey, conducted by the U. S. Public Health Service, which provides sample data on the incomes of families in 84 cities and 23 rural areas for the year 1935.⁶ Wherever the number of colored families was substantial, data were analyzed for colored and white families separately. In addition the Financial Survey of Urban Housing, inaugurated in 1934 by the U. S. Department of Commerce, makes available the distribution by income of Negro and white renter and owner-occupant families for a number of cities for 1933.

Comparison of the results for a few cities covered by the Consumer Purchases Study and one or both of these other two surveys shows fairly close agreement except that the income distributions indicated by the Consumer Purchases Study usually appear somewhat higher than those in the two other surveys.⁷ This, however, can be accounted for at least in part by the fact that the National Health Survey and the Financial Survey of Urban Housing did not include imputed income from owned homes and were based only on information concerning the broad income classes to which the families belonged. Extra income items, therefore, may have been overlooked in many cases. Also the time difference may be significant, at least in regard to the comparison with the Financial Survey of Urban Housing.

Between 1934 and 1936 the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics studied the money income and disbursements of families of employed wage earners and low-salaried clerical workers in the larger cities of the United States. In 15 of the 42 cities covered, Negro as well as white families were surveyed. In view of the fact that the study was undertaken primarily in order to bring up to date the items to be priced and the weights to be used in computing indexes of changes in living costs, families of employed workers that received relief and those with nonrelief incomes below \$500 were excluded. The data do not, therefore, as the reports on the investigation make clear, provide income data for Negro families which can be regarded as representative of the total Negro population of the cities surveyed.⁸

The most useful survey of farm income apart from the Consumer Purchases Study was found to be the Works Progress Administration study of landlords and tenants on cotton plantations in the Southeast for the crop year 1934.⁹ A total of 5,171 tenant families on 646 plantations in six states was enumerated. The income data for sharecroppers cannot be compared directly with the findings of the Consumer Purchases Study; but the plantation survey also provides information concerning the incomes of wage hands, a group omitted from the larger study.

⁶ The rural sample is considered less satisfactory than the urban sample.

⁷ See p. 72.

⁸ See Faith M. Williams and Alice C. Hanson, *Money Disbursements of Wage Earners and Clerical Workers in the North Atlantic Region, 1934-36*, Bulletin No. 637, Vol. I—New York City, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, 1939, p. 71.

⁹ T. J. Wooster, Jr., and Others, *Landlord and Tenant on the Cotton Plantation* Research Monograph V, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1936.

Appendix B

CONSUMER PURCHASES STUDY EXPENDITURE SAMPLE

A relatively unique sampling procedure was employed in the expenditure part of the Consumer Purchases Study. From the selected random sample of native-born normal families, a smaller group was selected to supply information on family expenditures. The purpose was to obtain, so far as possible, a uniform number of families for analysis in each "cell"—a cell comprising families of similar composition, income, and, in nonfarm communities, occupation. In rural areas and in some of the small cities this method of control was discarded owing to technical difficulties encountered during the field work, but it was found that the expenditure sample was not significantly different from the random sample of native-born, normal families. In building up the expenditure pattern for families in most cities, the figures for each "cell" were multiplied by the frequency of families in the larger income sample which were considered eligible to provide information on consumption.¹

¹ It was possible to reduce the number of schedules for "cells" which included a comparatively large number of families in the general population and at the same time get better coverage and thus more reliable data for "cells" which were of interest for purposes of comparison but which would, in a random sample, have too few representatives for statistical analysis. Full use was not made of the advantages of this method, however. The sample was inadequate in regard to certain types of large families, some of which were not represented at all. Therefore, possibilities of measuring the influence of family type on consumption were limited. Furthermore, the random sample used in the weighting procedure was by no means ideal, and the number of cases in a "cell" was often too small to insure full reliability. This occurred even in the case of "cells" to which heavy weights were applied.

The data for two of the small cities in the South (Albany, Ga., and Gastonia, N. C.) were collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the sample was controlled in the manner described above. The data for the other two small cities in the region (Griffin, Ga., and Sumter, S. C.) were collected by the Bureau of Home Economics and no attempt was made to control the frequencies. In view of the small number of families that supplied information in these four cities, it was decided to combine them for tabulation and analysis. The tabulation was prepared by the Bureau of Home Economics. After a number of statistical tests, it was found that the distribution by income, family type, and occupation of families in the expenditure sample was not significantly different from that of families in the regular income sample which were considered eligible to supply expenditure information. Consequently, expenditure data for the four small southern cities were weighted by the counts in the expenditure sample.

Actually there were several expenditure samples. All families that furnished expenditure schedules were also asked to provide, on so-called check lists, additional information regarding weekly consumption of food at home, the annual clothing purchases of different family members, and expenditures during the year for the purchase of different items of furnishings and equipment. Some of the families, however, did not supply the detailed information called for on one or more of these check lists.

The expenditure samples included much smaller proportions of low-income families than are found in the general population. In the first place, there were the original limitations of the income sample, such as exclusion of broken families in rural areas, of farm laborers, and of sharecroppers, other tenants, and owners who had been on their farms less than one year. In the second place, in selecting the expenditure sample broken families were excluded in urban as well as rural areas. Of foremost importance was the fact that families found from the income study to have received relief at any time during the year were excluded entirely from the expenditure sample. This resulted in a substantial overstatement of the consumption of all nonfarm families but particularly of urban Negroes in the North. In southern farm counties the exclusion of relief families was less significant for Negroes than for whites, but the other limitations operated, by and large, to bias the data upwards more for Negroes than for whites.

In cities and villages the population covered was further restricted by the omission of nonrelief families at the very low income levels: families with incomes below \$500 in New York City; white families with incomes below \$500 in Atlanta, Georgia, and Columbus, Ohio; Negro families with incomes below \$250 in Columbus; and white families with incomes below \$250 in southern villages and small and middle-sized cities. These families were omitted largely because they were not numerous enough in the population to supply sufficient cases for analysis. For the same reason their exclusion has little influence on the results.

Not only were broken families excluded from the consumption sample but also large normal families, particularly those containing many adults,² were omitted. Furthermore, in the small and middle-sized southern cities sampled, in New York City, and among whites in Atlanta and Negroes in Columbus, normal families with 3 or 4 children under 16 and no adults other than the husband and wife and families of 7 or 8 persons, at least one of whom was under 16, were also excluded. Hence the possibilities of measuring the influence of family type on consumption are somewhat restricted.³

² Families containing 5 or more adults and no children under 16; families containing 8 or more adults, with or without children under 16; and families with 2 or more adults and 7 or more children under 16.

³ More important, however, is the fact that the family-type classification which was used in the expenditure study in most communities in which Negroes were sampled was not particularly valuable for this purpose.

There were certain other minor restrictions with regard to the consumption sample. Probably the most important from the point of view of this analysis was the exclusion of families having the equivalent of more than one roomer and/or boarder in the household during the year of the study.

Finally, it seems probable that there was an unintentional underrepresentation of poorly organized families in the expenditure sample, since those families which maintain at least a minimum degree of organization of their family economy would be more able than others to provide information sufficiently reliable for use in the study.

METHOD OF PRESENTATION AND MEANING OF TERMS

The number of families sampled is shown in Table A by family type for each of the 10 units for which expenditure information is available from the Consumer Purchases Study for both Negroes and whites. The average number of persons per family is summarized for selected groups in Table B.

Comparison of the expenditures of Negro and white families of similar composition with similar incomes will bring to light any racial differences in consumption habits that are largely unrelated to immediate economic pressures.⁴ It is evident, however, that such differences are small in comparison with differences attributable to variations in income status and family composition. In order to show how general economic factors affect the consumption of Negroes and whites, it would be necessary to examine the (weighted) average expenditures of all Negro and white families sampled in each community.⁵ Due to the character of the expenditure samples, such general figures overstate the average expenditures for various goods and services and understate the differential between the races. Also the mean expenditures per family for all income groups combined do not provide a picture of the consumption of any identifiable group of families. Among whites, for example, the high expenditures and large savings of the relatively few families at the upper income levels give each of these families much more influence on the average figures than each of the much larger number of low-income families. The pattern of spending at the point in the income scale

⁴ This is not to say that any consumption differences between families belonging to the same income class and family type are entirely "cultural." There may be certain underlying factors which are economic, at least in the broad sense: some families might feel greater economic insecurity than others and restrict their expenditures accordingly; the occupations of the family earners might influence their dietary needs. Also within each income class Negroes tend to be more concentrated than whites at the lower levels.

⁵ Since such over-all averages were not included in the publications of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, they have been computed for the more important categories of consumption. They have not been computed for all items of consumption and for all communities or community groups.

Table A. - Number of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Expenditures, by Income, Family Type, $\frac{2}{3}$ and Color, 1935-36

Income and family type	Georgia and Mississippi cotton counties						North Carolina and South Carolina cotton and tobacco counties						34 southern villages	
	Farm operators			Sharecroppers			Farm operators			Sharecroppers			Negro	White
	Negro		White	Negro		White	Negro		White	Negro		White		
	511	1,255	482	626	433	1,945	639	632	973	632	91	17	185	2,092
All groups	117	261	77	125	49	251	66	96	332	96	37	17	185	463
Family type I	123	302	185	171	65	373	147	192	258	192	147	16	139	730
II-III	208	528	164	221	154	733	208	147	268	147	208	25	71	690
IV-V	63	164	70	95	155	588	208	197	115	197	91	17	185	209
VI-VII														
Less than \$500	208	176	202	435	140	145	237	91	550	237	91	17	185	63 $\frac{2}{3}$
Family type I	65	60	45	111	20	38	37	17	185	37	17	17	185	-
II-III	54	51	88	140	32	38	80	33	155	80	33	16	139	-
IV-V	67	46	48	127	36	38	57	16	139	57	16	16	139	-
VI-VII	22	19	21	57	52	30	63	25	71	63	25	25	71	-
\$500-\$999	241	540	280	151	192	523	324	302	368	324	302	302	368	493
Family type I	45	118	32	14	22	84	27	63	127	27	63	63	127	117
II-III	53	140	83	45	20	138	64	97	95	64	97	97	95	178
IV-V	108	198	116	94	85	160	125	62	104	125	62	62	104	133
VI-VII	35	84	49	38	65	141	108	80	42	108	80	80	42	66
\$1,000-\$1,499	62	242	-	-	78	508	78	175	55	78	175	175	55	560
Family type I	7	33	-	-	5	70	2	12	20	2	12	12	20	124
II-III	16	50	-	-	11	94	3	52	8	3	52	52	8	206
IV-V	33	119	-	-	36	193	36	45	25	36	45	45	25	172
VI-VII	6	40	-	-	26	151	37	66	2	37	66	66	2	58
\$1,500-\$1,999	-	107	-	-	23	297	-	64	-	-	64	64	-	422
Family type I	-	16	-	-	-	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	106
II-III	-	21	-	-	-	51	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	145
IV-V	-	56	-	-	-	123	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	133
VI-VII	-	14	-	-	-	102	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39
\$2,000-\$2,999	-	86	-	-	-	309	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	369
\$3,000 or more	-	104	-	-	-	163	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	185

Table A. - Number of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Expenditures, by Income, Family Type, $\frac{a}{b}$ and Color, 1938-36 (continued)

Income and family type	Four small southern cities				Columbia, S. C., and Mobile, Ala.				Atlanta, Ga.				Columbus, Ohio				New York, N. Y.			
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
All groups	475	1,108			680	1,406			869	1,888			248	2,260			294	1,703		
Family type I	144	238			186	290			236	318			69	407			127	413		
II-III	157	437			205	528			187	640			76	704			80	726		
IV-V	174	453			227	586			291	630			83	723			87	564		
VI-VII	-	-			-	-			155	-			-	426			-	-		
Less than \$500	206	33 $\frac{b}{b}$			169	28 $\frac{b}{b}$			158	-			14 $\frac{b}{b}$	-			-	-		
Family type I	66	-			61	-			43	-			-	-			-	-		
II-III	77	-			61	-			-	-			-	-			-	-		
IV-V	61	-			47	-			46	-			-	-			-	-		
VI-VII	-	-			-	-			29	-			-	-			-	-		
\$500-\$999	199	201			262	150			355	96			69	138			40	60		
Family type I	54	46			83	29			116	22			30	30			21	22		
II-III	65	87			82	61			74	41			34	52			14	24		
IV-V	80	68			97	60			109	33			25	32			5	14		
VI-VII	-	-			-	-			56	-			-	24			-	-		
\$1,000-\$1,499	60	269			135	299			219	244			92	375			99	231		
Family type I	19	63			33	64			51	53			35	68			37	56		
II-III	11	124			45	118			46	109			27	138			33	110		
IV-V	30	102			57	117			69	82			30	64			29	65		
VI-VII	-	-			-	-			53	-			-	85			-	-		
\$1,500-\$2,249	10 $\frac{a}{a}$	376			33	461			73	499			41	780			112	523		
Family type I	-	62			7	91			15	101			16	118			48	120		
II-III	-	141			12	170			15	200			8	250			28	230		
IV-V	-	153			14	200			37	198			17	246			36	173		
VI-VII	-	-			-	-			6	-			-	164			-	-		
\$2,250-\$2,999	-	136			21	220			41	343			12	503			34	354		
\$3,000 or more	-	73			-	246			23	406			-	464			9	535		

a/ Normal families were classified into the following types on the basis of the number and age of members other than husband and wife:

- I - No other person (families of 2).
- II - One child under 16 (families of 3).
- III - Two children under 16 (families of 4).
- IV - One person 16 and over and one or no other person regardless of age (families of 3 or 4).
- V - One child under 16, one person 16 and over, and one or two others regardless of age (families of 5 or 6).
- VI - Three or four children under 16 (families of 5 or 6).
- VII - One child under 16 and 4 or 5 others regardless of age (families of 7 or 8).

b/ Excludes families with incomes under \$250.

c/ Excludes families with incomes above \$2,000.

Source: Consumer Purchases Study.

Table B. - Average Number of Persons per Family in Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Income, Family Type, ^a and Color, 1935-36

Income and Family type	Georgia and Mississippi						34 southern villages				atlanta, Ga.				New York, N. Y.				
	Farm operators			Sharecroppers			Negro		White		Negro		White		Negro		White		
	Negro	White		Negro	White		Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	
All groups	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1		3.4	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	2.8	3.3	2.8	3.4	2.8	3.4	2.8
Family type I	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.2		2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
II-III	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5		3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5
IV-V	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.6		4.1	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.4	4.2	3.8	4.4	3.8	4.2	4.2
VI-VII	6.7	6.6	6.6	6.6	6.7		6.2	6.1	6.3	6.2	6.1	6.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less than \$500	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.6		3.4	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Family type I	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0		2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
II-III	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4		3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5
IV-V	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.4		4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8
VI-VII	(6.6)	(6.0)	6.2	(6.3)	6.3		6.0	-	6.2	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$500-\$999	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.6	4.4		3.5	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4	2.7	3.0	2.7	3.4	2.7	3.4	3.0
Family type I	2.0	2.1	2.0	(2.0)	2.0		2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	(2.0)	(2.0)	(2.0)	2.0	(2.0)	(2.0)	(2.0)
II-III	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.5		3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	(3.5)
IV-V	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6		4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.4	4.2	3.9	4.4	3.9	4.2	(4.1)
VI-VII	6.7	6.3	6.3	7.1	6.7		6.6	5.8	6.2	6.2	5.8	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$1,000-\$1,499	4.1	4.4	4.4	-	-		3.4	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.3	2.7	3.2	2.7	3.3	2.7	3.2	3.2
Family type I	-	-	-	-	-		(2.0)	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
II-III	-	-	-	-	-		-	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5
IV-V	-	-	-	-	-		-	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.4	3.9	4.3	3.9	4.4	3.9	4.3	4.3
VI-VII	-	-	-	-	-		-	6.3	6.7	6.7	6.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$1,500-\$1,999(\$2,249) ^b	-	4.1	4.1	-	-		-	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.4	2.9	3.2	2.9	3.4	2.9	3.2	3.2
Family type I	-	-	-	-	-		-	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
II-III	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5
IV-V	-	-	-	-	-		-	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	3.8	4.2	3.8	4.4	3.8	4.2	4.2
VI-VII	-	-	-	-	-		-	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$2,000(\$2,250) ^b -42,999	-	3.9	3.9	-	-		-	3.7	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.4	2.8	3.4	2.8	3.4	2.8	3.4	3.4
\$3,000 or more	-	3.6	3.6	-	-		-	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.6

^a Fewer than 10 cases.

^b See Table A, footnote 2.

^c For Atlanta and New York the income classes are \$1,500-\$2,249 and \$2,250-\$2,999.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 10 to 25 cases

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 643 and 647, Vol. II.

Familiar Summary, Table 2; and U. S. Department of Agriculture,

Miscellaneous Publication No. 396, Tables 40 and 51, and Miscellaneous

Publication No. 389, Tables 28 and 36.

where the median falls, therefore, gives a better representation of typical spending habits.

Whenever possible, goods obtained without money expense, whether home-produced or received as gift or pay, were considered together with goods purchased. Moreover, the total value of goods and services purchased was included as expenditures regardless of whether payment was made in full or even in part during the year of the study.

The full expenditure for the purchase of durable goods, such as automobiles, refrigerators, living-room suites, and the like (whether or not payment was made in full), was included with outlays for nondurable consumer goods and services. Since relatively few families buy a given item of durable goods during any one year, the averaging among all families of the amounts spent by these few families has provided a figure that may be taken to represent annual depreciation cost for such items. This is not a reliable assumption, however, in view of the fact that the purchase of durable goods fluctuates widely with general business conditions.

Sales taxes were generally included in the expense of the items to which they apply. Taxes on owned homes and on automobiles were likewise included with the expenditures for these goods. There is some dispute as to whether income, poll, and certain personal property tax payments, gifts, and church and public-welfare contributions, representing largely transfers of income rather than outlays for goods and services, should be included with expenditures for current living. On the ground that church contributions generally provide some direct return and that taxes provide an indirect return, though not in direct ratio to their amount, it seemed reasonable to group them with outlays for consumer goods and services. Moreover, the size and the importance, in relation to expenditures for goods and direct services, of gifts and contributions is one measure of the level of living of families. Therefore, these categories have been treated as part of the value of living, following the procedure adopted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of Home Economics in their analyses of the Consumer Purchases Study data. In many studies of family living, life- and annuity-insurance-premium payments are grouped with outlays for goods and services for current living, but in the Consumer Purchases Study and most other recent surveys they have been treated as savings.

Appendix C

LISTS OF TABLES

TEXT TABLES

1. Changes in the Rural-farm Population in Southern States, by Color, 1920-1940	11
2. Workers in Agriculture, by Tenure Status, 1930	13
3. Average Acreage per Farm and Average Value of Land and Buildings per Acre and per Farm in the South, by Color and Tenure of Operator, 1920, 1930, and 1935	14
4. Negro Male Workers in Nonagricultural Pursuits, 1910 and 1930, in States with 100,000 Negro Population or More in 1930	22
5. Expanding Nonagricultural Industries with 150,000 Workers or More, of Whom Less than 4 Per Cent Were Negroes in 1930	26
6. Male Workers in Nonagricultural Occupations, by Socio-economic Status and Race, 1910 and 1930	28
7. Proportion of All Persons 10 Years of Age and Over Gainfully Employed, by Section, Color, and Sex, 1890-1930	30
8. Proportion of All Females 10 Years of Age and Over Gainfully Employed in 1900 and 1930 in Cities with 50,000 Population or More in 1900 and 100,000 Population or More in 1930, by Section and Color	30
9. Proportion of All Persons 10 Years of Age and Over Gainfully Employed, by Age, Sex, and Color, 1900, 1920, 1930 ...	32
10. Proportion of All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over in the Labor Force, by Sex, Age, Residence, and Color, March 24-30, 1940	34
11. Females 14 Years of Age and Over Not in the Labor Force and Engaged in Housework as Per Cent of All Females, by Residence, Age, Geographic Division, and Color, 1940	36
12. Proportion of All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over in School, by Residence, Age, Geographic Division, Sex, and Color, 1940	37
13. Proportion of All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over Unable to Work, by Age, Residence, Geographic Division, Sex, and Color, 1940	38

14. Proportion of All Males 14 Years of Age and Over in Institutions, by Geographic Division and Color, 1940	39
15. Persons Totally Unemployed or on Public Emergency Work as Per Cent of the Labor Force (15-74 years of age), by Section, Size of Community, Age, Sex, and Color, November, 1937	40
16. Incidence of Unemployment among Persons in the Labor Force 14 Years of Age and Over, by Sex, Age, Residence, and Color, March 24-30, 1940	42
17. Per Cent of Workers, 16-25 Years of Age, in the Urban Labor Force with Specified Scholastic Achievement Who Are Unemployed, by Color and Sex, 1935-36	44
18. Employed Persons (except on Public Emergency Work) as Per Cent of All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over, by Residence and in Selected Large Cities, by Sex and Color, 1940..	45
19. Average Size of Family, by Section, Residence, Age of Members, and Color, 1930	48
20. Type of Families, by Section, Residence, and Color, 1930	50
21. Per Cent Distribution of Normal and Broken Families, by Size and Color, 1930	52
22. Per Cent Distribution of Normal Families and of Broken Families with Women Heads by Number of Children under 21 Years of Age, by Section, Residence, and Color, 1930	53
23. Per cent of Negro and Native White Families with Lodgers, by Section, Residence, and Color, 1930	55
24. Number of Gainful Workers per Family, by Section, Residence, and Color, 1930	56
25. Number of Children under 21 Years of Age in Families with 3 Gainful Workers or More, by Family Type, Section, Residence, and Color, 1930	58
26. Estimated Average Income of Negro and White Nonrelief Families, by Region and Type of Community, 1935-36	60
27. Per Cent Distribution of Negro and White Families in Selected Communities, by Relief Status and Nonrelief Income, 1935-36	63
28. Net Income of Cotton-Plantation Tenant Families, by Tenure and Color, 1934	68
29. Gross Income per Negro Farm Family in Greene and Macon Counties, Ga., by Tenure, 1927 and 1934	68
30. Sources of Family Income and Proportion of Families with Nonfarm Earnings among Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Farm Families in Selected Groups of Southern Counties, by Tenure and Color, 1935-36	75
31. Source of Income of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal, and Broken Families in 5 Southern Cities, by Color, 1935-36	78
32. Average Earnings per Family of Principal and Secondary Earners, Number and Average Earnings of Supplementary	

Earners, and Median Income per Family by Number of Earners among Native-born, Nonrelief Families in 5 Southern Cities, by Color, 1935-36	79
33. Per Cent of Native-born, Normal Families on Relief, Median Income of Nonrelief Families, and Mean Earnings of Husbands in Nonrelief Families in 3 Southern Cities, by Age of Husband and Color, 1935-36	84
34. Comparison of the Incomes Received during 1935-36 by Families in 5 Cities Included in the Consumer Purchases Study with the Cost of the WPA Budget for an Emergency Level of Living Priced in the Same Cities in March, 1935, by Color..	88
35. Average Net Surplus of Deficit and Per Cent of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities with a Deficit, by Income and Color, 1935-36	92
36. Average Net Surplus or Deficit of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Cities, by Color, Income, and Family Type, 1935-36	94
37. Total Expenditures by Major Categories of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Family Type, Income, and Color, 1935-36	96
38. Proportion of All Family Food Obtained without Direct Money Expenditure by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Color, 1935-36	103
39. Money Expenditure for Food as a Per Cent of Total Money Expenditures by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Georgia and Mississippi Counties, by Tenure, Color, and Income, 1935-36	104
40. Average Value of Major Food Groups Consumed at Home during One Week by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Color, Family Type, and Income, 1936	106
41. Average Quantity of Specified Foods Consumed at Home during One Week, May-August, 1936, by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga., by Income and Color	111
42. Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga., Reporting Consumption of Specified Processed Foods during One Week, May-August, 1936, by Color and Income	116
43. Average Nutritive Value of Diets per Day per Requirement Unit of Negro Families in 5 Southern Cities and of White Families in 3 East South Central Cities, December, 1934-February, 1937	119
44. Approximate Proportions of Urban Families in a Selected Sample Whose Diets Provided Less than the "Fair" or "Good" Standard Amounts, Respectively, of Various Nutrients per Requirement Unit at the \$1.25-\$1.87 Weekly per	

Capita Food-expenditure Level, by Color, December, 1934-February, 1937	122
45. Grade of Diet of Families of Employed Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers with a Weekly per Capita Food Expenditure of \$1.25-\$1.87, by Color and Region	122
46. Average Nutritive Value of Diets per Nutrition Unit per Day by Money Value of Food per Week per Food-expenditure Unit, for Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Farm Areas, by Color, 1936-37	124
47. Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Farm Families in the Southeast Whose Diets during One Week Were below Optimal Requirements in Various Respects, by Color and Selected Food-expenditure Groups, 1936-37	125
48. Selected Groups of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Farm Families, by Grade of Diet and Color, 1936-37	126
49. Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families Which Spent Less than \$50 and Less than \$100 for Food per Person per Year in Selected Cities, by Color and Family Type, 1935-36	128
50. Per Cent Distribution of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in 34 Southern Villages by Money Value of Food per Meal per Food-expenditure Unit, by Family Type, Income, and Color, March-November, 1936	129
51. Average Expenditure and Proportion of Total Expenditures by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Household Operation, by Family Type, Income, and Color, 1935-36	131
52. Average Expenditure and Proportion of Total Expenditures of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Household Furnishings and Equipment, by Family Type, Income, and Color, 1935-36	134
53. Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Ownership of Specified Equipment, by Income and Color, 1935-36	135
54. Average Expenditure and Proportion of Total Expenditures by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Clothing, by Color, Family Type, and Income, 1935-36	138
55. Average Expenditure for Clothing of Husbands and Wives in Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Family Type, Income, and Color, 1935-36	140
56. Average Expenditure by Husbands for Barbershop Services and by Wives for Beauty-parlor Services in Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Family Type, Income, and Color, 1935-36	143
57. Average Expenditure and Proportion of Total Expenditures of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Com-	

	munities for Transportation, by Income and Color, 1935-36..	145
58.	Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Owning Automobiles, by Income and Color, 1935-36	146
59.	Average Expenditure and Proportion of Total Expenditures of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Medical Care, by Family Type, Income, and Color, 1935-36	148
60.	Per Capita Expenditures for Medical Care in Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities, by Family Type and Color, 1935-36	150
61.	Average Expenditure of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Reading, Tobacco, and Other Recreational Activities, by Family Type, Income, and Color, 1935-36	155
62.	Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Atlanta, Ga., and Columbus, Ohio, Reporting Ownership of Specified Equipment, by Income and Color, 1935-36	158
63.	Average Expenditure of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Formal Education, by Family Type, Income, and Color, 1935-36	160
64.	Average Expenditure of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Contributions and Personal Taxes, by Family Type, Income, and Color, 1935-36	162
65.	Average Expenditure of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Atlanta, Ga., for Contributions and Personal Taxes, by Income and Color, 1935-36	164
66.	Proportion of Farmhouses with Specified Facilities, by Geographic Divisions, 1934	168
67.	Farmhouses in 11 Southern States, by Material of Houses and Color of Operator, 1934	170
68.	Proportion of Farmhouses in 11 Southern States in Which Specified Structural Items Were Characterized by Survey Enumerators as in Poor Condition, by Color of Operator, 1934	171
69.	Farmhouses in 11 Southern States with Specified Water Supply, by Color of Operator, 1934	173
70.	Farmhouses in 11 Southern States with Refrigeration and Power Washing Machines, by Color of Operator, 1934	175
71.	Average Number of Rooms per Farmhouse and Average Number of Occupants per House and per Room, by Geographic Divisions, 1934	177
72.	Average Number of Rooms and Average Number of Occupants per Room in Farmhouses in 11 Southern States, by Color and Tenure of Operator, 1934	178
73.	Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Southern Farm Counties with More than 1.5 Persons and More than 2 Persons per Room, by Family Type, Tenure, and Color, 1935-36	180

74. Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Southeastern Villages with Specified Indoor Water Supply, by Color, 1935-36	181
75. Source of Drinking Water in the Negro Village of Bertrandville, La.	182
76. Toilet, Lighting, Cooking, and Heating Facilities of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Southeastern Villages, by Color, 1935-36	183
77. Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Southeastern Villages with More than 1.5 and More than 2 Persons per Room, by Family Type, 1935-36	184
78. Proportion of Families in Selected Cities Using Gas or Electricity for Cooking, by Color and Tenure, 1933	188
79. Per Cent of Dwelling Units in Selected Cities Which Were Reported in Need of Major Repairs or Unfit for Use, by Color of Occupants	190
80. Per Cent of Specified Types of Dwelling Units in Selected Cities Which Were Occupied by Negroes	191
81. Proportion of Dwellings in Selected Cities with Specified Degree of Crowding and Proportion of Persons Living in Dwellings with Specified Degree of Crowding, by Color	193
82. Proportion of Dwelling Units in Selected Cities with More than 2 Persons per Room, by Color and Size of Household ..	194
83. Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in 4 Small Southern Cities with More than 1.5 and More than 2 Persons per Room, by Family Type, 1935-36	195
84. Proportion of Dwelling Units in 4 Selected Cities Occupied by Tenants and Owners, by Color	196
85. Median Monthly Rental of Tenant-occupied Dwelling Units in Selected Cities	197
86. Monthly Rental for Tenant-occupied Dwelling Units in 4 Selected Cities, by Color by Occupants	198
87. Rent Delinquency in Selected Cities, by Color, 1933	199
88. Per Cent Distribution of Nonwhite Population in Blocks Having a Specified Proportion Nonwhite in 8 Groups of Cities, According to Proportion Nonwhite in the Total Population, 1934	205
89. Negro and White Relief Population, October, 1933, as Per Cent of Total Negro and White Population, 1930, in Total United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930, by Residence	220
90. Negro and White Economic Heads of Families under 65 Years of Age on Relief, March, 1935, as Per Cent of Total Negro and White Families, 1930, by Residence, Geographic Divisions, and States	222
91. Rural Counties in Selected Southern States, by Negro and White Relief Incidence, March, 1935	224

92.	Rural Counties in Selected Southern States, by Relation between Negro and White Relief Incidence, March, 1935	225
93.	Relief Incidence in Counties Representative of Selected Rural Areas, by Color, October, 1933-October, 1935	226
94.	Employment Status of Persons 16-64 Years of Age on Relief in 79 Sample Cities, May, 1934, by Sex and Color	230
95.	Average Monthly General Relief Benefit per Case, February, June, and October, 1935, in Sample Counties in 9 Rural Areas and in the Eastern and Western Cotton Areas, by Color	235
96.	Comparison of Median Works Program and Private-employment Wage Rates with Median Relief Grants to Same Cases during Last 30 Days on Relief of Relief Cases Closed in 13 Cities, October-December, 1935, by Color	237
97.	Proportion of Nonwhites in the Total Population and among All Unemployed Workers, April, 1940, and Proportion of Negroes among WPA Workers, April 30, 1941, in States with 100,000 Negro Population or More in 1930	240
98.	Employment of Negroes on WPA Projects in Selected Southern States, September, 1937-April, 1941	242
99.	Proportion of Negroes among Heads of All Families, 1930, among Economic Heads of Families on Relief, March, 1935, and among Workers on WPA, February, 1939, by Region and Sex	244
100.	Emergency Workers as Per Cent of All Unemployed Workers According to the Unemployment Check Census of 1937 and the 1940 Census by Sex and Color	246
101.	Per Cent Colored among Persons Seeking Work and among Emergency Workers, by Sex and Residence, 1940	247
102.	Proportion of Economic Heads of Families on Relief, March, 1935, Whose Usual Occupation Was Other than Unskilled and of WPA Workers, May, 1940, Assigned to Other than Unskilled Occupations, by Color, and Proportion of Negroes among These Same Groups by Class of Usual Occupation, March, 1935, and by Wage Class, May, 1940, for Selected Southern States	250
103.	Total and Negro Employment on WPA Projects in Selected Southern States, by Type of Project, May 1, 1940	252
104.	Proportion of Negroes among Junior Enrollees in the Civilian Conservation Corps, January 31, 1934-February, 1941	256
105.	Proportion of Negroes among Junior Enrollees in the Civilian Conservation Corps, May 31, 1939, and in the Single Male Population 15-24 Years of Age, 1930, by Residence and Area	257
106.	Estimated Employment of Negro Youth on NYA Programs, January, 1940	262
107.	Proportion of Negroes among Recipients of NYA School Aid, December, 1939, among Pupils in Secondary Schools, 1937-38,	

and in the Total Population 15-19 Years of Age, 1930, by States	264
108. Proportion of Negroes among Recipients of NYA College and Graduate Aid, December, 1939, among Students in Colleges and Universities, 1935-36, and in the Total Population, 1939, by States	265
109. Proportion of Negroes among Youth Employed on NYA Out-of-school Work Projects, December, 1939, and in the Total Population 15-24 Years of Age, 1930, by States	266
110. Proportion of Negroes among Youth Employed on NYA Out-of-school Work Projects, by Region and Type of Project, December, 1939	268
111. Negro Recipients of Old-age Assistance Accepted during the Fiscal Years 1937-38, 1938-39, and 1939-40 in Continental United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930, Negro Recipients as Per Cent of All Recipients, Negroes as Per Cent of Total Population 65 Years of Age and Over in 1930, and Nonwhites as Per Cent of Total Population 65 Years of Age and Over, 1940	273
112. Per Cent Distribution by Race, Sex, and Age of Recipients of Old-age Assistance Accepted during the Fiscal Years 1937-38, 1938-39, and 1939-40, for All States	275
113. Average Monthly Payments to white and Negro Recipients of Old-age Assistance Accepted during the Fiscal Year 1939-40 in States Accepting 100 Negro Recipients or More	276
114. Negro Recipients of Aid to the Blind Accepted during the Fiscal Years 1937-38, 1938-39, and 1939-40 in Continental United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930, Negro Recipients as Per Cent of All Recipients, and Per Cent of Negroes in the General Population, 1930	279
115. Median Monthly Payments Initially Approved for Recipients of Aid to the Blind in the United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930 Accepted during the Fiscal Year 1939-40, by Color	280
116. Negro Children Accepted for Aid to Dependent Children during the Fiscal Years 1937-38, 1938-39, and 1939-40 in Continental United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930, Negro Children as Per Cent of All Children Accepted, and Negro Children as Per Cent of All Children under 16 Years of Age in the 1930 Population	283
117. Average Monthly Payment per Family and per Child under Aid to Dependent Children in the United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930 for Families Accepted during the Fiscal Year 1939-40, by Color	285
118. Cases Receiving General Relief, February, 1941, in Continental United States and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930 as Per Cent of All Occupied Dwelling Units, 1940	288

119.	Proportion of Negro Cases among All Cases on General Relief, 1939-40, and Proportion of Nonwhites in the Total Population, 1940, in Selected Cities	289
120.	Average General Relief Benefits, January, 1941, in 41 States Combined and in States with 100,000 Negroes or More in 1930	289
121.	Active Standard Rural Rehabilitation Borrowers in 4 Southern Regions of the Farm Security Administration, by Race or Color, December 31, 1939	299
122.	Low-income Farm Families (Estimated), 1935, and Active Standard Rural Rehabilitation Borrowers, December 31, 1939, in 4 Southern Regions of the Farm Security Administration, by Color	300
123.	Loan Advances to All Active Standard Borrowers in the South, December 31, 1939, and Record of Repayments, by Color	301
124.	Summary of Rehabilitation Progress of Active Standard Borrowers in the South, by Color	303
125.	Tenant-purchase Borrowers, by Color, 1937-June 30, 1940 ..	306
126.	Urban Dwelling Units in United States Housing Authority-aided Projects under Loan Contract, Estimated Racial Occupancy, May, 1940, and Urban Families in the United States, 1930, by Race	319

APPENDIX TABLES

1.	Gainfully Employed Negroes 10 Years of Age and Over, by Sex and Occupation, 1890, 1900, and 1910, According to the Occupational Classification of 1900	351
2.	Gainfully Employed Negroes 10 Years of Age and Over, by Sex and General Divisions of Occupations, 1910, 1920, and 1930	352
3.	Farm Operators in the South, by Tenure, Color, and Number of Years on Farm, 1930 and 1935	353
4.	Number of Tenants, by Color, in Plantation and Nonplantation Counties of 11 Southern States, 1900 and 1930	354
5.	Cotton Acreage and Cotton Production in Principal Cotton-growing States, 1909-1929	355
6.	Number of Farm Operators in Southern States by Color and Tenure, and Colored Farm Operators as Per Cent of Total, 1910-1940	356
7.	Nonagricultural Industry and Service Groups Having 15,000 Negro Workers or More in 1930	358
8.	Proportion of All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over Gainfully Employed, April 1, 1930, and in the Labor Force, March 24-30, 1940, in Selected Large Cities, by Age, Sex, and Color ..	359
9.	Proportion of All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over Gainfully Employed, April 1, 1930, and in the Labor Force, March	

24-30, 1940, in Selected Geographic Divisions, by Age, Sex, and Color	360
10. Labor Force as Per Cent of the Total Population, 16-64 Years of Age, and the Unemployed as Per Cent of the Labor Force in Urban Areas, by Color, Sex, and Age, 1935-36	361
11. Proportion of Persons 15-74 Years of Age Employed or Available for Employment, by Section, Residence, Age, Sex, and Color, November, 1937	361
12. Unemployed Persons as Per Cent of All Gainful Workers, by Section, April 1, 1930, and in Selected Large Cities, January, 1931, by Sex and Color	362
13. Incidence of Unemployed among All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over and among Persons in the Labor Force of the Same Age, by Sex, Residence, Geographic Division, and Color, and in Large Cities, March 24-30, 1940	363
14. Percentage Distribution by Functional Class of Persons 15 Years of Age and Over in Check Areas of the Unemployment Census, by Color, Residence, and Sex, November, 1937	364
15. Average Size of Family, by Section and Color, 1890-1930	365
16. Per Cent Distribution of Families by Number of Members, by Color, Section, and Residence, 1930	366
17. Per Cent Distribution of Families by Number of Children under 10 and under 21 Years of Age and Per Cent Distribution of Children by Number of Children in Family, by Color, Section, and Residence, 1930	367
18. Per Cent Distribution of Normal Families, by Number of Children under 21 Years of Age, by Residence, Age of Head, and Color, 1930	369
19. Per Cent Distribution of Normal and Broken Families in Urban Areas with Specified Number of Children under 21 Years of Age, by Color and Number of Lodgers, 1930	370
20. Income and Relief Status of Families in Selected Cities, by Color, 1935	371
21. Income of Families in Selected Cities, by Color, 1933	373
22. Family Incomes among Employed Wage Earners and Lower-salaried Clerical Workers in Selected Cities in One Year during the Period 1934-36, by Color	374
23. Per Cent Distribution of Sharecroppers and Other Share Tenants on Plantations According to Amount of Annual Subsistence Advance, by Color, 1934	375
24. Source of Income of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Southeastern Villages, by Color, 1935-36	376
25. Per Cent Distribution of Native-born, Normal Farm and Village Families in the Southeast, by Relief Status and Non-relief Income and by Size, Type, and Color, 1935-36	377
26. Per Cent Distribution of Native-born, Normal Families in	

Selected Cities, by Relief Status and Nonrelief Income and by Size, Type, and Color, 1935-36	378
27. Average Quantity of Specified Foods Consumed at Home during One Week, March-November, 1936, by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Southern Farm Counties, by Color, Tenure, Family Type, and Income	380
28. Average Number of Times Daily Various Foods Appeared in the Diets of Negro and White School Children in Two Texas Counties, Spring and Winter, 1927-29	382
29. Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Consumption of Specified Foods during One Week, March-December, 1936, by Color, Family Type, and Income	383
30. Proportion of Husbands and of Wives Reporting Expenditures for Specified Items of Clothing in Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga., by Income and Color, 1935-36	386
31. Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Expenditures for Specified Toilet Articles, and Proportion of Husbands and Wives in These Families Reporting Expenditures for Barbershop or Beauty-parlor Services, by Color, 1935-36	387
32. Per Cent Distribution of Negro and White Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Atlanta, Ga., According to the Expenditure for Medical Care, by Income, 1935-36	388
33. Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Receiving Some Free Medical Care, by Income and Color, 1935-36	389
34. Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Expenditures for Specified Types of Medical Care, by Color and Income, 1935-36	390
35. Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Health and Accident Insurance and Average Premium Payment for Families Reporting Such Insurance, by Income and Color, 1935-36	391
36. Average Expenditure of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Specified Types of Recreation, by Income and Color, 1935-36	392
37. Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Contributions for Support of Relatives, by Income and Color, 1935-36	393
38. Farmhouses in 11 Southern States, by Age of House and Color of Operator, 1934	394
39. Farmhouses in 11 Southern States, by Condition of Doors and Windows and Color of Operator, 1934	395
40. Farmhouses in 11 Southern States, by Condition of Screens and Color of Operator, 1934	395

41. Farmhouses in 11 Southern States with Specified Toilet Facilities, by Color of Operator, 1934	396
42. Farmhouses in 11 Southern States with Specified Bathroom Facilities and with Kitchen Sinks with Drains, by Color of Operator, 1934	397
43. Farmhouses in 11 Southern States Lighted by Gas or Electricity, by Color of Operator, 1934	398
44. Farmhouses in 11 Southern States with Specified Kind of Cooking Stove, by Color of Operator, 1934	399
45. Number and Per Cent of Farms in Continental United States and 16 Southern States Receiving Central-station Electric Service, 1934 and 1940	400
46. Selected Characteristics of Urban Households by Geographic Regions, 1934-36	401
47. Proportion of Households in Selected Cities Having Specified Toilet Facilities, by Color, Income, and Relief Status, 1935-36	402
48. Type of Heating Apparatus in Dwelling Units in Selected Cities, by Color and Tenure, 1933	403
49. Proportion of Dwelling Units in Selected Cities Which Were Reported in Need of Major Repairs or Unfit for Use, by Color of Occupants and Number of Rooms	404
50. Number of Rooms per Dwelling Unit in Selected Cities, by Color of Occupants	405
51. Proportion of Dwellings in Selected Cities with More than One Person per Room, by Color, Relief Status, and Income, 1935-36	406
52. Proportion of Families in Selected Cities Owning Homes, by Color, 1930 and 1933	407
53. Per Cent Distribution of Owner-occupied Residential Properties in Selected Cities, by Ratio of Debt (Principal Only) to Value and Color of Owner, January 1, 1934	408
54. Per Cent Distribution of First Mortgages on Owner-occupied Residential Properties in Selected Cities, by Agencies Holding the Mortgages and Color of Owner, January 1, 1934	408
55. Per Cent Distribution of First Mortgages on Owner-occupied Residential Properties in Selected Cities, by Contract Interest Rate and Color of Owner, January 1, 1934	409
56. Per Cent Distribution of Tenant Families in Selected Cities, by Family Size, Color, and Monthly Rental	410
57. Per Cent Distribution of Tenant-occupied Dwelling Units in Selected Cities, by Number of Rooms, Color, and Monthly Rental	411
58. Per Cent of Negro Families among All Families on Relief, May, 1934, and in the Total Population, 1930, and Incidence of Relief by Color, May, 1934, in 30 Selected Cities	412
59. Size of Families on Relief, October, 1933, and of All Families, 1930, by Residence and Color	413

60. Mean Size of Rural Relief Cases in Sample Counties in the Eastern and Western Cotton Areas, February, June, and October, 1935, by Color 414
61. Broken Families and Nonfamily Persons or Groups as Per Cent of All Relief Cases, October, 1933, May, 1934, and June, 1935, by Color and Residence 414
62. Average Monthly General Relief Benefit per Case in Selected States, July, 1933, 1934, and 1935 415
63. Per Cent of Relief Cases Receiving Work Relief Only or in Combination with Direct Relief, February, June, and October, 1935, in Sample Counties in 9 Rural Areas in the Eastern and Western Cotton Areas, by Color 416
64. Proportion of Negroes in the Relief Population, March, 1935, and on WPA Projects, May, 1940, in Counties with Cities of 10,000 or More and in Counties with No Cities of 10,000 or More in 1930 in 12 Selected Southern States 416
65. Per Cent Distribution of Monthly Payments Initially Approved for Negro Recipients of Old-age Assistance Accepted during the Fiscal Year 1939-40 in States Accepting 100 Negro Recipients or More 417
66. Per Cent Distribution of Monthly Payments Initially Approved for White Recipients of Old-age Assistance Accepted during the Fiscal Year 1939-40 in States Accepting 100 Negro Recipients or More 418
67. Average Number of Families and Persons Served through the Distribution of Surplus Commodities in Continental United States and in Southern States, Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1940 419
68. Peak Number of Schools and Children Served in School-lunch Programs in Continental United States and in Southern States, 1939-40, as Per Cent of All Public Schools and Total Public-school Enrollment, 1935-36 419
69. Size of Farm during the Crop Year prior to Application for a Loan of a sample of Farm Security Administration Standard Loan Clients Receiving Their First Standard Loans between March 1, 1936, and February 28, 1939, by Region and Color 420
70. Colored Farm Families as Per Cent of All Farm Families Accepted as Standard Rural Rehabilitation Borrowers in 4 Southern Regions of the Farm Security Administration, 1935-1939 421
71. Tenure Status during the Crop Year prior to Application for a Loan of a Sample of Farm Security Administration Standard Loan Clients Receiving Their First Standard Loans between March 1, 1936, and February 28, 1939, by Region and Color 422
72. Negro Families on Resettlement Projects, June, 1940 423
73. Negro Participants in Land Rental Co-operative Associations, June, 1940 424

Appendix D

APPENDIX TABLES

Appendix table 1. - Gainfully Employed Negroes, 10 Years of Age and Over, by Sex and Occupation, 1890, 1900, and 1910, According to the Occupational Classification of 1900 ^{a/}

Sex and Occupation	Number of Negro Workers (in thousands)			Negro Workers as per cent of all workers			Index Numbers (1890 = 100)	
	1890	1900	1910	1890	1900	1910	1900	1910
Males								
All occupations	2,101	2,675	3,179	10.9	11.3	10.6	127	151
Agricultural pursuits	1,301	1,561	1,830	15.5	16.6	17.0	120	141
Professional service	25	32	38	4.0	3.8	3.3	126	151
Domestic and personal service	451	636	496	17.7	18.2	18.1	141	110
Trade and transportation	143	205	323	4.6	4.8	5.0	143	225
Manufacturing and me- chanical pursuits	181	242	491	3.9	4.2	5.4	133	271
Females								
All occupations	972	1,317	2,014	24.3	24.8	24.9	136	207
Agricultural pursuits	428	582	1,051	55.6	59.5	58.2	136	246
Professional service	9	16	28	2.8	3.6	4.2	177	319
Domestic and personal service	506	682	861	30.3	32.5	32.9	135	170
Trade and transportation	2	4	11	1.0	0.8	0.9	176	485
Manufacturing and me- chanical pursuits	27	33	62	2.6	2.5	3.5	123	230

^{a/} The discrepancies between Tables 1 and 2 can be explained by the differences between the occupational classifications of 1900 and 1930.

Sources: Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910, Population Vol. IV, pp. 54-56; and U. S. Bureau of the Census, Negro Population in the United States, 1790-1918, pp. 526-527.

Appendix table 2. - Gainfully Employed Negroes ^{a/} 10 Years of Age and Over, by Sex and General Divisions of Occupations, 1910, 1920, and 1930 ^{b/}

Sex and Occupation	Number of Negro Workers (in thousands)			Negro Workers as per cent of all workers			Index Numbers (1910 = 100)	
	1910	1920	1930	1910	1920	1930	1920	1930
Males								
All occupations	3,179	3,253	3,663	10.5	9.8	9.6	102	115
Agriculture	1,784	1,521	1,493	15.9	15.9	15.6	85	84
Forestry and fishing	34	31	32	13.9	11.6	12.7	93	94
Extraction of minerals	61	73	75	6.3	6.7	7.6	119	123
Manufacturing and mechanical industries	588	796	924	6.7	7.3	7.6	135	157
Transportation and communication	255	309	395	10.0	10.8	11.1	121	155
Trade	113	130	169	3.6	3.6	3.3	115	160
Public service (not elsewhere classified)	22	50	49	5.1	6.8	5.9	226	225
Professional service	39	43	73	4.0	3.7	4.2	110	189
Domestic and personal service	268	272	424	21.9	22.6	23.9	102	158
Clerical occupations	16	28	30	1.4	1.7	1.5	177	185
Females								
All occupations	2,014	1,571	1,841	24.9	18.4	17.1	78	91
Agriculture	1,051	612	495	58.2	56.5	54.4	58	47
Forestry and fishing	t	t	t	25.5	24.5	24.3	118	58
Extraction of minerals	t	t	t	7.4	11.8	7.0	9/	9/
Manufacturing and mechanical industries	68	105	101	3.7	5.5	5.4	154	148
Transportation and communication	1	4	2	1.2	1.6	0.8	267	165
Trade	7	12	15	1.5	1.7	1.5	162	204
Public service (not elsewhere classified)	t	1	1	6.2	8.7	5.3	309	310
Professional service	30	39	63	4.0	3.9	4.1	132	212
Domestic and personal service	853	791	1,153	33.7	36.2	36.2	93	135
Clerical occupations	3	8	11	0.5	0.6	0.5	263	380

t Fewer than 500 Workers.

^{a/} In 1910 and 1920 Mexicans were included with whites; in 1930 they were included with other races.^{b/} Figures for earlier years have been reclassified for purposes of comparison with 1930 data. See U. S. Bureau of the Census, Negroes in the United States, 1920-1932, p. 287^{c/} Base of less than 100.Source: Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. V, pp. 74-75.

Appendix table 3 - Farm Operators in the South, a/ by Tenure, Color, and Number of Years on Farm, 1930 and 1935

Tenure and color	Year	Number of farm operators reporting years on present farm	Per cent of farm operators who had spent specified number of years on farm					
			Less than 1	1	2-4	5-9	10-14	15 or more
All farm operators	1930	852,232	23.6	16.7	22.1	14.4	8.7	14.4
Colored	1935	798,826	27.3	9.3	21.1	15.9	9.0	17.4
White	1930	2,247,217	22.3	13.0	16.7	14.3	11.1	22.7
	1935	2,546,202	23.7	8.3	18.3	15.2	10.3	24.1
Full owners	1930	133,981	3.7	4.2	11.0	14.7	17.5	48.8
Colored	1935	146,461	4.6	2.6	11.0	15.8	14.8	51.1
White	1930	988,133	5.9	5.7	12.3	16.9	17.0	42.2
	1935	1,161,400	7.2	4.0	13.8	17.6	14.9	42.6
Tenants (other than croppers)	1930	296,063	19.5	16.3	25.9	18.5	9.4	10.3
Colored	1935	265,412	27.1	9.7	23.2	18.1	9.8	12.4
White	1930	685,752	34.2	19.9	22.6	13.2	5.5	4.5
	1935	835,136	40.0	12.8	23.4	13.0	5.5	5.3
Croppers	1930	381,543	35.6	22.5	23.8	10.8	4.1	3.1
Colored	1935	361,382	36.5	12.3	24.3	14.1	5.7	5.1
White	1930	372,345	50.9	21.7	17.4	6.4	2.2	1.4
	1935	340,697	48.8	14.2	22.5	9.2	3.0	2.4

a/ South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central divisions.

Source: United States Census of Agriculture: 1935, Vol. III, pp. 204-205.

Appendix table 4 .- Number of Tenants, by Color, in Plantation and Nonplantation Counties of 11 Southern States, 1900 and 1930

State	Plantation counties a/				Other counties b/				Per cent change, 1900-1930	
	Colored		White		Colored		White		Colored	White
	1900	1930	1900	1930	1900	1930	1900	1930		
Total-11 southern states	398,012	500,716	212,196	348,358	142,474	175,916	313,417	521,949	23.5	66.5
Virginia	1,893	3,084	2,972	4,918	16,137	12,064	30,594	27,904	-25.2	-8.8
North Carolina	17,519	31,153	15,701	30,858	19,704	25,976	40,084	49,618	31.8	23.8
South Carolina	4,984	40,892	22,283	30,719	22,267	30,470	6,350	10,687	-8.1	68.3
Georgia	46,905	44,380	28,867	37,023	24,338	31,256	34,450	61,731	28.4	79.2
Florida	891	974	277	896	5,990	4,404	3,662	10,463	-26.5	185.7
Tennessee	15,271	18,921	10,362	15,605	9,116	8,351	56,391	70,643	-8.4	25.3
Alabama	75,058	70,293	35,497	56,792	4,843	7,582	13,476	31,753	56.6	135.6
Mississippi	97,262	139,271	20,213	39,006	10,337	20,898	10,040	26,442	102.2	163.4
Arkansas	28,648	58,776	9,668	28,645	6,314	9,325	36,510	55,945	47.7	53.2
Louisiana	39,718	47,287	11,274	25,372	8,985	15,926	7,257	18,966	77.3	161.5
Texas c/	30,863	45,675	55,082	78,524	14,443	19,664	74,603	157,797	36.1	111.5

a/ Includes data for 303 counties classified as "plantation counties" in 1910 (Thirteenth Census of the United States:1910, Agriculture Vol. V, Chap. 12); 22 "plantation counties" are included with "Other counties" because boundary changes between 1900 and 1910 make it impossible to obtain comparable data for 1900 and 1930. Of these 22 counties, 3 are in Alabama, 10 in Georgia, and 9 in South Carolina.

b/ Includes data for 806 nonplantation counties (counted according to 1930 boundaries), and for the 22 "plantation counties" referred to in footnote a.

c/ Mexicans included with whites. There may be a certain amount of unreliability in the data, however, making it necessary to exercise particular caution in interpreting the increases in Texas.

Sources: Fifteenth Census of the United States:1930, Agriculture Vol. II, County table I; and Twelfth Census of the United States:1900, Agriculture Vol. V, Part 1, pp. 56-141.

Appendix table 6 -- Cotton Acreage and Cotton Production in Principal Cotton-growing States, 1909-1939

State	Thousands of acres in cotton				Cotton production in thousands of (square) bales			
	1909	1919	1929	1939	1909	1919	1929	1939
Total - 16 states	32,036	33,734	43,208	22,791	11,169	11,874	15,105	11,702
Virginia	25	47	88	30	10	25	52	13
North Carolina	1,274	1,373	1,640	710	665	858	764	458
South Carolina	2,557	2,631	1,973	1,177	1,280	1,477	836	850
Georgia	4,883	4,720	3,406	1,856	1,992	1,682	1,344	905
Florida	263	110	123	59	65	20	34	11
Tennessee	788	807	1,045	677	788	808	1,045	677
Alabama	3,731	2,628	3,567	1,931	1,130	718	1,313	773
Mississippi	3,400	2,948	4,010	2,449	1,127	958	1,875	1,533
Arkansas	2,153	2,553	3,447	2,057	777	869	1,399	1,351
Louisiana	957	1,343	1,946	1,089	269	307	799	718
Oklahoma	1,977	2,732	4,148	1,671	556	1,006	1,130	521
Texas	9,930	11,521	16,814	8,106	2,455	2,972	3,794	2,724
New Mexico	1	10	137	90	t	5	91	100
Arizona	t	105	211	183	t	59	150	199
California	t	86	300	316	t	46	254	436
Missouri	97	110	353	390	55	64	225	433

t Fewer than 500 acres.

Source: Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Agriculture, State Reports, First Series, State table 4.

Appendix table 6 --Number of Farm Operators in Southern States by Color and Tenure, and Colored Farm Operators as Per Cent of Total, 1910-1940

State and year	Number in thousands						Colored operators as per cent of total operators		
	Colored			White					
	Owners and managers	Tenants (other than croppers)	Croppers	Owners and managers	Tenants (other than croppers)	Croppers	Owners and managers	Tenants (other than croppers)	Croppers
The South									
1910	220	670		1,342	866		14.1	43.6	
1920	219	370	334	1,396	660	227	13.6		59.5
1930	183	306	393	1,250	709	383	12.8	35.9	50.6
1935	186	261	368	1,404	854	348	11.7	23.4	51.4
1940	174	208	299	1,384	700	242	11.2	22.9	55.3
Virginia									
1910	32	16		103	33		24.0	32.2	
1920	31	11	6	107	23	8	22.5		43.9
1930	25	8	7	98	22	10	20.0	31.2	39.4
1935	28	9	6	112	31	12	19.9	27.2	33.5
1940	22	7	6	105	24	10	17.3	23.4	37.5
North Carolina									
1910	22	44		125	63		14.7	41.1	
1920	22	31	23	130	47	17	14.7	39.4	58.5
1930	20	22	35	122	46	34	13.9	32.6	50.4
1935	20	19	30	138	57	36	12.8	25.1	45.2
1940	18	15	27	137	48	33	11.6	23.8	45.0
South Carolina									
1910	21	76		45	35		31.4	68.6	
1920	23	53	33	46	27	11	33.5	66.2	75.0
1930	16	30	31	39	24	18	29.1	56.3	63.4
1935	18	28	30	44	29	16	29.4	49.2	65.4
1940	17	22	22	43	22	11	28.3	50.0	66.7
Georgia									
1910	16	107		84	84		15.8	55.9	
1920	16	53	61	88	57	36	15.7	48.1	62.8
1930	11	26	49	70	47	51	13.7	35.6	49.0
1935	11	24	39	76	60	42	12.3	28.5	48.2
1940	10	20	29	76	49	32	11.6	29.0	47.5
Florida									
1910	7	7		29	6		20.2	54.9	
1920	6	4	2	34	5	2	15.9	47.7	47.8
1930	6	4	1	37	8	3	13.4	33.4	28.9
1935	7	4	2	46	11	3	13.0	28.0	32.5
1940	6	3	1	41	9	2	12.8	25.0	33.3
Tennessee									
1910	11	28		134	74		7.4	27.3	
1920	10	14	15	139	52	23	6.6	20.8	38.4
1930	8	11	17	124	53	34	6.0	16.9	32.9
1935	8	10	16	139	65	35	5.3	13.9	31.3
1940	7	7	14	141	51	28	4.7	12.0	33.3

Appendix table 6.—Number of Farm Operators in Southern States by Color and Tenure, and Colored Farm Operators as Per Cent of Total, 1910-1940—continued

State and year	Number in thousands						Colored operators as per cent of total operators		
	Colored			White			Owners and managers	Tenants (other than croppers)	Croppers
	Owners and managers	Tenants (other than croppers)	Croppers	Owners and managers	Tenants (other than croppers)	Croppers			
Alabama									
1910	17	93		87	65		16.4	58.9	
1920	17	51	27	91	50	21	16.1	50.5	56.8
1930	16	50	28	75	51	38	17.5	49.7	42.3
1935	16	42	33	81	66	35	16.2	39.1	48.9
1940	15	39	19	79	57	22	16.0	40.6	46.3
Mississippi									
1910	25	140		68	42		27.1	76.9	
1920	23	64	74	69	29	13	25.3	68.5	85.4
1930	23	57	103	64	33	32	26.1	63.3	76.1
1935	21	42	106	73	39	31	22.6	51.5	77.5
1940	24	34	102	75	34	23	24.2	50.0	81.6
Arkansas									
1910	15	49		93	58		13.7	45.6	
1920	15	24	33	98	47	15	13.6	33.7	68.6
1930	11	23	45	78	55	30	12.8	29.1	60.6
1935	11	19	41	90	67	25	11.2	22.0	62.5
1940	11	13	33	91	54	15	10.8	19.4	68.8
Louisiana									
1910	11	44		43	23		20.0	66.2	
1920	11	27	24	47	19	7	19.1	58.4	76.8
1930	11	31	32	43	27	17	19.6	53.3	65.2
1935	11	26	34	51	32	17	17.6	44.6	66.7
1940	12	20	28	49	29	12	19.7	40.8	70.0
Oklahoma									
1910	11	9		75	95		13.0	9.1	
1920	10	7	2	85	82	7	10.2	8.1	21.7
1930	8	10	5	70	94	16	10.7	9.6	21.7
1935	7	8	3	76	109	11	8.2	7.1	19.7
1940	7	6	1	76	86	4	8.4	6.5	20.0
Texas									
1910	21	40		177	171		10.8	22.1	
1920	24	27	28	180	137	40	11.6	16.5	40.9
1930	21	29	36	173	167	69	10.7	14.8	34.5
1935	21	25	26	194	184	51	9.7	12.1	33.6
1940	20	18	15	193	147	25	9.4	10.9	37.5

g/ Includes the following states in addition to those shown in the table: Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, West Virginia, and Kentucky.

Sources: Fourteenth Census of the United States:1920, Agriculture Vol. V, pp. 198-202; United States Census of Agriculture:1935, Vol. III, pp. 106, 107, and 126-133; and Sixteenth Census of the United States:1940, Agriculture.

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Appendix table 7. Nonagricultural Industry and Service Groups Having 15,000 Negro Workers or More in 1930

Industry and service group a/	Number of Negro workers, 1930 (in thousands)			Negro workers as percent of all workers, 1930	Per cent females among Negro workers, 1930	Index (1910 = 100)	
	United States	The South	The North and West			All workers	Negro workers
Forestry	26	25	1	13.3	1.2	109	100
Coal mines	58	46	12	8.4	.1	103	143
Building industry	181	97	84	7.0	.1	101	77
Chemical and allied industries	48	34	14	7.7	1.9	270	241
Fertilizer factories	17	b/	b/	60.4	.7	201	220
Cigar and tobacco factories	34	31	3	22.9	54.0	77	135
Clay, glass, and stone industries	29	15	14	7.8	2.6	101	101
Clothing industries	35	11	24	4.4	48.0	116	303
Suit, coat, and overall factories	15	b/	b/	4.8	16.7	82	158
Food and allied industries	57	31	26	6.2	20.8	169	278
Slaughter and packing houses	18	5	13	11.2	7.6	187	349
Iron, steel, vehicle and machinery industries	177	69	112	5.4	1.0	183	368
Automobile factories	26	3	23	4.0	1.1	606	4651
Blast furnaces and steel rolling mills	53	15	38	8.5	.6	155	291
Car and railroad shops	16	b/	b/	7.2	.8	174	368
Lumber and furniture industries	130	132	7	16.1	2.4	108	110
Saw and planing mills	114	112	2	25.1	1.4	97	102
Paper, printing and allied industries	17	8	9	2.2	12.3	161	302
Textile industries	26	21	5	2.1	24.4	132	231
Cotton mills	16	15	1	3.9	18.0	118	226
Miscellaneous manufacturing industries	141	100	41	6.7	22.4	120	114
Independent hand trades	28	19	9	7.8	76.2	42	53
Turpentine farms and distilleries	33	b/	b/	75.2	.9	111	103
Construction and maintenance of roads, streets, sewers and bridges	64	48	16	14.1	.5	191	174
Garages, greasing stations and automobile laundries	44	19	25	10.4	.4	b/	b/
Postal service	18	6	12	6.3	3.3	187	301
Steam railroads	163	105	58	10.3	1.1	102	125
Truck transfer and cab companies	41	b/	b/	8.5	.6	131	98
Water transportation d/	45	5/	5/	16.0	.7	135	139
Wholesale and retail trades, except automobiles e/	192	121	71	3.6	8.4	150	158
Public service (not elsewhere classified) f/	62	38	24	5.9	5.6	197	238
Recreation and amusement	35	16	19	7.9	16.0	b/	b/
Other professional and semi-professional service g/	138	103	35	4.7	48.1	b/	a/
Hotels, restaurants, boarding houses	226	124	104	16.8	46.4	b/	b/
Laundries and cleaning, dyeing and pressing shops	78	43	35	18.6	65.3	h/	h/
Other domestic and personal service i/	1,174	806	368	38.3	63.6	b/	b/

a/ Heterogeneous subgroups, such as "other iron and steel and machinery factories" are not listed, even when they had more than 15,000 Negro workers in 1930.

b/ Data not available.

c/ Includes 20,000 Negro seamstresses.

d/ Largest group of Negro workers was longshoremen and stevedores (25,000).

e/ Includes truck drivers, deliverymen, laborers, porters, and helpers in stores (100,000 Negro workers).

f/ Largest group of Negro workers was 32,000 "other laborers."

g/ Includes 25,000 Negro clergymen and 54,000 Negro schoolteachers.

h/ Figures available only for laundries; all workers - 199; Negro workers - 395.

i/ Largest groups of Negro workers were: cooks (206,000), other servants (494,000), home launderers and laundresses (270,000).

Sources: Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, Population Vol. V, pp. 408-587, and Population Vol. III, Part 1, p. 33; and Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910, Population Vol. IV, pp. 508-455.

Appendix table 8 - Proportion of All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over Gainfully Employed, April 1, 1930, and in the Labor Force, March 24-30, 1940, in Selected Large Cities, by Age, Sex, and Color

City and age	Per cent							
	Male				Female			
	Gainful workers, 1930		Labor force, 1940		Gainful workers, 1930		Labor force, 1940	
	Negro	White	Nonwhite	White	Negro	White	Nonwhite	White
New York City								
14 years and over..	92.3	86.6	81.0	81.2	77.6	30.8	50.4	32.7
14-19 years.....	44.6	43.0	27.0	29.5	37.3	40.9	23.9	28.6
20-24 years.....	94.9	91.0	88.9	88.8	64.2	61.3	65.2	68.3
25-44 years.....	97.8	98.2	93.2	95.7	61.4	28.2	58.4	36.7
45-64 years.....	96.3	93.1	82.9	88.4	54.8	17.6	41.2	20.5
65 years and over..	67.2	53.0	28.9	37.6	21.0	7.2	8.2	5.5
Chicago								
14 years and over..	91.2	86.3	78.3	82.4	46.7	30.3	36.6	33.3
14-19 years.....	40.6	36.9	24.8	29.4	24.6	36.1	15.4	28.8
20-24 years.....	92.5	91.3	86.6	90.5	51.8	57.5	49.4	64.8
25-44 years.....	97.9	98.5	90.6	96.9	52.8	29.3	44.0	30.0
45-64 years.....	95.7	94.4	81.5	90.5	41.1	18.6	31.1	21.4
65 years and over..	62.3	54.0	24.3	37.2	11.5	6.9	4.8	5.7
Philadelphia								
14 years and over..	91.3	86.4	78.6	81.1	49.9	30.3	42.6	31.7
14-19 years.....	45.2	45.3	30.2	34.1	36.3	40.9	22.7	28.3
20-24 years.....	94.5	90.6	87.8	90.9	57.7	58.9	54.9	63.3
25-44 years.....	97.7	97.9	91.3	95.9	52.7	28.9	49.3	36.6
45-64 years.....	96.8	94.6	84.6	89.8	48.4	19.6	39.2	22.1
65 years and over..	69.9	60.2	37.2	41.9	20.0	8.5	10.6	6.8
Detroit								
14 years and over..	92.0	86.3	86.0	84.8	34.7	24.9	30.3	26.0
14-19 years.....	36.3	34.0	32.0	31.9	16.6	28.1	18.4	25.8
20-24 years.....	95.1	93.4	94.6	92.2	37.7	46.5	35.1	53.8
25-44 years.....	98.4	99.0	96.3	97.5	38.1	23.3	36.1	29.5
45-64 years.....	96.5	95.6	89.6	92.7	31.6	15.4	23.2	18.3
65 years and over..	58.1	53.1	40.5	45.0	7.4	5.2	3.9	5.5

Sources: Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 6; and Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population.

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Appendix table 9 . . . Proportion of All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over Gainfully Employed, April 1, 1930, and in the Labor Force, March 24-30, 1940, in Selected Geographic Divisions, by Age, Sex, and Color

Division and age	Per cent							
	Male				Female			
	Gainful workers, 1930		Labor force, 1940		Gainful workers, 1930		Labor force, 1940	
	Negro	White	Nonwhite	White	Negro	White	Nonwhite	White
Middle Atlantic								
14 years and over .	90.2	84.4	78.0	79.2	48.9	26.0	44.0	28.1
14-19 years	42.8	39.2	28.3	30.1	31.6	32.3	22.2	23.8
20-24 years	93.7	89.8	85.7	88.6	55.6	32.3	58.7	58.1
25-44 years	97.2	97.8	90.6	95.1	52.8	24.9	51.6	38.5
45-64 years	98.7	93.6	84.6	88.7	48.0	16.7	38.3	18.8
65 years and over..	66.6	56.3	38.9	40.2	21.3	7.2	8.0	5.6
East North Central								
14 years and over .	87.4	83.4	76.4	79.2	37.6	21.9	32.6	23.7
14-19 years	36.1	34.5	28.5	31.0	19.0	22.1	17.3	19.7
20-24 years	90.2	90.0	83.6	88.9	41.4	44.5	41.8	47.7
25-44 years	95.8	97.7	89.2	95.5	42.9	22.3	39.3	27.5
45-64 years	94.1	93.6	84.0	89.5	37.0	15.3	29.1	16.9
65 years and over .	61.6	55.0	30.0	39.8	13.4	6.5	6.4	4.6
West North Central								
14 years and over .	85.0	82.3	75.5	78.4	36.6	19.3	31.9	21.1
14-19 years	39.4	38.0	33.5	35.1	17.2	16.5	15.9	17.6
20-24 years	88.2	86.8	84.6	87.3	40.1	39.1	42.2	48.3
25-44 years	95.1	97.6	88.5	95.0	42.9	20.2	39.7	24.2
45-64 years	93.3	93.5	86.0	89.9	39.2	14.8	30.7	16.3
65 years and over .	63.8	54.0	38.0	41.7	16.9	6.1	7.4	4.6
South Atlantic								
14 years and over .	87.8	83.7	81.0	79.5	43.5	20.2	40.3	24.1
14-19 years	63.4	45.6	53.3	39.2	32.3	18.9	24.6	16.1
20-24 years	93.4	89.7	89.7	89.1	47.7	34.1	47.2	39.4
25-44 years	96.6	97.0	92.0	94.4	48.9	21.0	49.0	29.8
45-64 years	95.9	94.2	88.5	88.1	45.7	15.4	40.6	18.1
65 years and over .	75.7	62.0	52.5	46.5	24.3	7.1	13.5	5.1
East South Central								
14 years and over .	89.5	84.4	82.3	79.4	44.2	18.8	36.4	17.6
14-19 years	65.0	48.0	52.6	41.6	36.9	13.7	24.2	11.6
20-24 years	94.8	90.3	90.4	88.0	44.3	26.4	40.2	26.3
25-44 years	97.5	97.3	93.7	94.5	47.6	16.4	43.3	21.6
45-64 years	97.1	95.5	91.0	89.4	47.3	13.1	37.3	13.7
65 years and over .	78.4	66.9	56.4	48.9	27.8	7.3	15.7	4.7
West South Central								
14 years and over	87.8	84.1	80.1	79.5	36.5	16.4	34.2	18.7
14-19 years	54.7	42.8	44.1	38.4	25.3	13.0	18.9	13.3
20-24 years	93.2	90.6	90.1	88.0	38.6	26.3	40.2	29.1
25-44 years	97.3	97.7	93.7	96.2	41.4	17.2	42.6	21.7
45-64 years	96.5	95.1	89.0	89.6	38.8	13.8	33.1	16.1
65 years and over	76.3	61.3	47.6	43.6	20.9	6.1	10.8	4.2

Sources: Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-4a, Sec. 11-16; and Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, Population.

Appendix table 10. - Labor Force as Per Cent of the Total Population, 16-64 Years of Age, and the Unemployed as Per Cent of the Labor Force in Urban Areas, by Color, Sex, and Age, 1935-36

Color and sex	All ages (16-64;	Age				
		16-24 years	25-34 years	35-44 years	45-54 years	55-64 years
Number of families in sample						
Colored males	75,941	16,009	20,235	20,547	13,346	5,804
Colored females	92,974	22,614	27,611	23,457	13,349	6,043
White males	735,771	168,614	176,610	170,610	138,194	61,643
White females	803,555	194,616	200,845	180,911	138,119	69,064
a/ Labor force as per cent of total population						
Colored males	92.4	74.0	98.7	98.1	96.7	90.7
Colored females	46.2	44.7	50.6	47.5	43.2	33.6
White males	90.3	67.0	98.6	98.6	97.5	90.7
White females	29.6	46.0	34.3	23.1	16.7	14.0
b/ Unemployed as per cent of labor force						
Colored males	35.8	47.3	31.0	32.5	35.8	40.6
Colored females	28.1	36.0	24.8	23.9	26.5	29.3
White males	20.6	36.2	15.7	14.8	18.6	25.0
White females	19.4	29.6	12.1	13.1	14.4	17.8

a/ Persons employed, on work relief, or seeking work.

b/ Persons on work relief or seeking work.

Sources: Bernard D. Karpinos, The Socio-Economic and Employment Status of the Urban Youth in the United States, 1935-1936, Federal Security Agency, U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D. C., 1941, Tables 3, 4, 21, and 22.

Appendix table 11. - Proportion of Persons 16-74 Years of Age Employed or Available for Employment, a/ by Section, Residence, Age, Sex, and Color, November, 1937

Section, size of community, and age	Per cent employed or available for employment			
	Male		Female	
	Colored	White	Colored	White
United States total	66.5	84.6	46.4	29.6
The North	67.6	85.3	55.0	30.6
The South	65.6	83.6	44.1	26.6
The West	65.5	83.5	52.8	29.5
Urban				
1,000,000 population or more	68.4	87.2	60.6	35.0
350,000 to 1,000,000 population ..	66.4	87.2	55.4	37.1
25,000 to 350,000 population	66.7	86.1	57.8	34.7
10,000 to 25,000 population	67.1	86.0	59.4	32.4
Less than 10,000 population	67.5	84.6	62.2	30.3
Rural	65.0	81.5	26.8	16.9
15-19 years	65.5	43.1	33.9	31.7
20-24 years	90.4	69.4	56.7	53.0
25-34 years	95.6	96.4	87.3	35.5
35-44 years	94.6	96.1	83.5	26.6
45-54 years	93.1	94.2	45.9	21.5
55-64 years	86.6	86.1	34.1	15.6
65-74 years	60.0	55.5	16.0	7.2

a/ Includes the fully employed, part-time workers, emergency workers, partly unemployed, and totally unemployed.

Sources: Calvert L. Dedrick and Morris H. Hansen, Final Report on Total and Partial Unemployment, 1937, Vol. IV, The Enumerative Check Census, Census of Partial Employment, Unemployment, and Occupations, Washington, D. C., 1938, pp. 38-39, 71-73, and 103-106.

Appendix table 12.—Unemployed Persons as Per Cent of all Gainful Workers, by Section, April 1, 1930, *a*/ and in Selected Large Cities, January, 1931, *b*/ by Sex and Color

Section and city	Per cent unemployed			
	Male		Female	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
April 1, 1930				
United States total	6.4	7.1	4.6	4.7
The North	14.3	6.2	6.2	4.9
The South	4.1	4.1	3.7	3.6
The West	9.7	7.5	7.4	5.1
January, 1931				
Boston, Mass.	26.2	26.2	30.3	17.6
Buffalo, N. Y.	50.2	34.5	42.0	17.3
New York, N. Y.				
Bronx	24.6	21.0	18.5	16.7
Brooklyn	30.6	23.0	28.5	16.7
Manhattan	26.4	19.4	28.6	11.2
Philadelphia, Pa.	42.4	27.3	41.0	20.8
Pittsburgh, Pa.	46.0	30.2	50.8	16.9
Cleveland, Ohio	52.5	33.5	55.1	17.2
Chicago, Ill.	43.5	29.7	56.5	19.4
Detroit, Mich.	60.2	32.4	75.0	17.4
St. Louis, Mo.	40.2	23.4	47.9	15.0
Birmingham, Ala.	36.0	18.2	30.6	14.8
New Orleans, La.	36.2	19.2	34.6	15.0
Houston, Tex.	35.4	18.1	46.2	13.4
Los Angeles, Calif.	29.9	18.6	38.3	12.7

a/ Includes both Class A (persons out of a job, able to work, and looking for a job) and Class B (persons having jobs but on layoff without pay, excluding those sick or voluntarily idle).

b/ The Unemployment Census for January, 1931, covered 19 large cities. Those having 10,000 or more Negro gainful workers were included in the table.

Sources: Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Unemployment Vol. II, pp. 232 ff. and 370-373.

Appendix table 13. - Incidence of Unemployment among All Persons 14 Years of Age and Over and among Persons in the Labor Force of the Same Age, by Sex, Residence, Geographic Division, and Color, and in Large Cities, March 24-30, 1940

Sex, residence, division, and city	Persons seeking work or on public emergency work as per cent of total population 14 years of age and over		Persons seeking work or on public emergency work as per cent of total labor force				Public emergency work a/ work a/ work a/	
	Total		Total		Total		Total	
	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White
Male								
United States total	14.1	11.1	17.6	14.2	10.7	9.5	6.9	4.7
Rural-farm	3.5	6.7	4.2	6.3	2.3	4.4	1.9	3.9
Rural-nonfarm	14.9	13.7	20.1	16.3	12.0	11.0	8.1	7.3
Urban	21.0	11.9	24.3	15.0	14.3	10.9	10.0	4.1
Middle Atlantic division	24.0	13.3	33.3	14.8	22.2	13.3	11.1	3.5
East North Central division	27.7	10.6	36.2	13.7	17.0	8.8	19.2	4.9
West North Central division	24.9	10.4	33.0	13.3	17.8	7.7	15.5	5.6
South Atlantic division	9.6	7.7	11.9	9.7	7.5	6.6	4.4	3.9
East South Central division	9.2	9.9	11.2	12.4	7.4	6.6	3.8	5.6
West South Central division	12.1	10.3	15.3	12.9	9.9	7.7	5.3	5.2
New York	24.2	14.5	29.9	17.9	19.3	15.0	10.6	2.9
Chicago	27.7	11.7	35.3	14.2	16.7	11.1	12.6	3.1
Philadelphia	30.7	14.3	39.0	17.7	33.7	15.6	5.3	2.1
Detroit	29.5	10.5	33.1	12.3	15.7	9.6	17.4	2.7
Female								
United States total	5.5	3.1	14.5	13.0	11.3	9.6	3.2	3.4
Rural-farm	1.2	1.4	4.8	13.4	3.9	8.5	0.9	4.9
Rural-nonfarm	3.8	2.7	11.3	13.9	9.2	8.9	2.1	5.0
Urban	8.3	3.6	16.1	12.7	14.0	9.6	4.1	2.9
Middle Atlantic division	10.2	4.1	23.2	14.6	15.2	12.8	5.0	1.8
East North Central division	10.6	2.6	32.4	11.2	19.9	8.2	15.5	3.0
West North Central division	8.6	2.4	27.1	11.5	16.7	7.6	9.4	3.9
South Atlantic division	4.2	2.7	10.4	11.2	8.9	6.7	1.5	4.5
East South Central division	3.2	2.7	8.7	14.8	7.6	8.6	1.1	4.0
West South Central division	4.5	2.9	13.2	15.5	10.9	8.7	2.3	4.8
New York	11.5	5.3	23.4	12.1	12.9	14.9	3.5	1.2
Chicago	15.1	3.7	35.9	11.0	24.4	9.3	11.5	1.7
Philadelphia	18.5	5.0	39.4	15.9	22.9	14.2	6.5	1.7
Detroit	9.0	3.9	29.6	13.9	19.2	11.7	10.6	2.2

a/ The total number of emergency workers shown in the census (2,350,067 persons) was well below the figure reported by the federal agencies (2,905,196 persons, exclusive of the FTA Student Work Program). See Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940. Preliminary releases, Series P-4, No. 5.

Source: Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940. Preliminary releases, Series P-4, Nos. 4 and 6, and Series P-4a, Nos. 11-16.

Appendix table 16 - Percentage Distribution by Functional Class of Persons 15 Years of Age and Over in Check Areas of the Unemployment Census, by Color, Residence, and Sex, November, 1937

Color and residence	Total	Totally unemployed	Partly unemployed	Emergency workers	Part-time workers	Fully employed	Ill or voluntarily idle	Not available for employment
Male								
White								
Urban	100.0	14.7	7.2	5.1	1.4	60.8	0.7	12.1
1,000,000 or more	100.0	12.5	6.9	5.3	1.2	63.2	0.7	12.1
350,000-1,000,000	100.0	12.6	8.6	5.2	1.4	60.3	0.7	13.2
25,000-350,000	100.0	10.8	7.8	5.1	1.6	61.9	0.8	14.2
10,000-25,000	100.0	10.4	8.9	5.0	1.5	61.0	0.9	14.3
Less than 10,000	100.0	10.6	8.4	5.2	2.2	57.2	1.2	17.3
Rural								
1,000,000 or more	100.0	23.6	8.1	9.4	1.6	45.8	1.0	10.6
350,000-1,000,000	100.0	23.3	11.9	10.7	0.9	41.8	0.8	10.8
25,000-350,000	100.0	20.5	15.4	7.7	1.0	44.1	0.7	10.6
10,000-25,000	100.0	16.7	13.1	4.4	1.5	53.4	0.7	12.2
Less than 10,000	100.0	16.7	14.3	5.0	1.7	52.0	0.8	11.7
Rural	100.0	8.6	10.1	1.8	2.1	60.5	1.4	15.6
Female								
White								
Urban	100.0	8.0	2.9	0.6	1.1	22.3	0.5	64.5
1,000,000 or more	100.0	6.9	2.8	1.0	1.1	25.3	0.5	62.4
350,000-1,000,000	100.0	7.5	3.8	1.0	1.2	21.5	0.5	64.6
25,000-350,000	100.0	6.7	3.2	0.8	1.2	21.3	0.5	67.1
10,000-25,000	100.0	5.7	3.3	0.8	1.4	19.0	0.5	69.2
Less than 10,000	100.0	4.3	1.6	0.5	0.9	9.5	0.4	82.7
Rural								
1,000,000 or more	100.0	21.9	11.3	2.2	2.3	22.9	1.6	37.8
350,000-1,000,000	100.0	24.1	7.4	1.8	1.3	20.7	1.3	43.3
25,000-350,000	100.0	18.9	10.0	1.8	1.7	25.4	1.2	41.0
10,000-25,000	100.0	10.1	8.9	1.3	3.2	36.0	0.7	39.9
Less than 10,000	100.0	14.8	9.5	0.6	2.6	34.6	0.9	36.9
Rural	100.0	5.0	3.9	0.2	1.3	16.2	1.3	71.9

Source: Calvert L. Dedrick and Morris H. Hansen, Final Report on Total and Partial Unemployment, 1937, Vol. IV, The Enumerative Check Census, Census of Partial Employment, Unemployment, and Occupations, Washington, 1938, pp. 71-73.

Appendix table 15. - Average a/ Size of Family, by Section and Color, 1890-1930 b/

Section	Average size of family									
	Negro					White				
	1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1890	1900	1910	1920	1930
United States total	5.3	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.9	4.7	0	4.3	4.1
The North	4.9	4.6	4.2	4.1	4.2	0	4.6	0	4.3	4.0
The South	5.4	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.3	0	5.2	4.8	4.7	4.4
The West	5.3	4.4	4.0	3.9	3.5	0	4.6	0	3.9	3.6

a/ Mean.

b/ With the exception of data for whites in 1900 and data for whites and Negroes in 1930, the averages are derived by dividing the total population by the total number of families (both private families and quasi-family groups). For whites in 1900 and for whites and Negroes in 1930, the figures refer to population per private family only. In some cases other nonwhites are included with Negroes.

c/ Data not available.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Negro Population in the United States, 1790-1915, p. 464, and Negroes in the United States, 1920-1932, pp. 260-261; Fifteenth Census of the United States; 1930, Population Vol. VI, pp. 11 and 54; Fourteenth Census of the United States; 1920, Population Vol. II, pp. 38, 39, and 1282; and Twelfth Census of the United States; 1900, Population Part II, pp. xx and 742-750.

Appendix table 16. - Per Cent Distribution of Families by Number of Members, by Color, Section, and Residence, 1930

Color, section, and residence	Per cent of families with specified number of members										
	all families	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
Negro											
United States total	100.0	12.1	26.4	17.9	12.9	9.4	6.9	5.0	3.6	2.4	3.4
The North											
Urban	100.0	13.8	32.4	18.7	12.6	8.5	5.6	3.5	2.1	1.3	1.5
The South											
Urban	100.0	16.0	29.9	19.0	12.5	8.4	5.5	3.6	2.2	1.3	1.6
Rural-nonfarm	100.0	14.9	26.4	18.1	12.8	9.2	6.5	4.6	3.1	2.0	2.4
Rural-farm	100.0	6.0	19.9	16.5	13.6	11.1	9.1	7.4	5.7	4.2	6.5
Native white											
United States total	100.0	7.3	24.1	22.0	18.1	11.8	7.2	4.3	2.5	1.4	1.3
The North											
Urban	100.0	7.3	26.8	24.1	18.8	11.1	5.9	3.0	1.5	0.8	0.7
The South											
Urban	100.0	6.0	23.9	23.3	19.0	12.3	7.2	4.0	2.2	1.1	1.0
Rural-nonfarm	100.0	5.6	20.1	20.8	18.4	13.5	9.1	5.7	3.4	1.8	1.6
Rural-farm	100.0	2.8	15.6	17.4	16.8	14.3	11.3	8.4	5.8	3.7	3.9

Source: Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. VI, pp. 13-15 and State table 5'

Appendix table 17. - Per Cent Distribution of Families by Number of Children under 10 and under 21 Years of Age and Per Cent Distribution of Children by Number of Children in Family, by Color, Section, and Residence, 1930

Color, section, and residence	Number of families or of children under 10 years of age a/ (in thousands)	Per cent of families or of children by specified number of children under 10 years of age						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6 or more
Families								
Negro families	2,804	59.0	16.7	10.3	6.8	4.3	2.1	0.8
The North								
Urban	514	68.1	14.4	6.3	4.9	2.7	1.2	0.4
The South								
Urban	785	67.1	15.8	6.5	4.8	2.5	1.0	0.3
Rural-nonfarm ..	446	59.0	17.1	10.5	6.8	4.1	1.8	0.7
Rural-farm	962	46.7	18.8	12.9	9.6	6.9	3.6	1.5
Native-white families	20,969	58.3	19.9	12.1	5.9	2.7	0.9	0.2
The North								
Urban	7,685	62.6	19.9	10.9	4.3	1.6	0.5	0.2
The South								
Urban	2,195	66.1	21.9	12.2	5.2	2.0	0.5	0.1
Rural-nonfarm ..	1,530	47.9	21.9	15.4	8.9	4.3	1.3	0.3
Rural-farm	2,335	44.2	20.6	15.8	10.8	6.0	2.1	0.5
Children b/								
Negro children	2,528	-	18.5	22.8	22.6	19.2	11.5	5.4
The North								
Urban	334	-	22.1	25.6	22.8	16.5	9.0	4.0
The South								
Urban	503	-	24.6	26.6	22.4	15.6	7.7	3.1
Rural-nonfarm ..	393	-	19.5	23.8	23.1	18.9	10.2	4.5
Rural-farm	1,231	-	14.7	20.2	22.5	21.5	14.1	7.0
Native-white children	16,483	-	25.3	30.9	22.6	13.6	5.7	1.9
The North								
Urban	4,966	-	30.8	33.9	20.1	9.9	3.9	1.4
The South								
Urban	1,608	-	29.9	33.3	21.4	10.6	3.7	1.1
Rural-nonfarm ..	1,603	-	20.8 ⁹	29.4	25.5	16.3	6.2	1.7
Rural-farm	2,845	-	16.9	25.9	26.5	19.9	8.4	2.4

Appendix table 17.- Per Cent Distribution of Families by Number of Children under 10 and under 21 years of Age and Per Cent Distribution of Children by Number of Children in Family, by Color, Section and Residence, 1930 (continued)

Color, section, and residence	Number of families or of children under 21 years of age ^a (in thousands)	Per cent of families or of children by specified number of children under 21 years of age						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6 or more
Families								
Negro families	2,804	41.1	18.9	12.7	8.9	6.3	4.5	7.6
The North								
Urban	514	52.1	19.0	11.5	7.3	4.3	2.7	3.1
The South								
Urban	785	48.3	20.5	12.3	7.7	4.8	2.9	3.5
Rural-nonfarm ..	446	42.0	19.7	12.9	8.9	6.2	4.2	6.1
Rural-farm	962	27.8	17.5	13.8	11.0	8.8	7.0	15.1
Native-white families	20,989	39.1	21.7	16.6	9.9	5.7	3.3	3.7
The North								
Urban	7,685	43.4	23.4	16.7	8.5	4.1	2.0	1.9
The South								
Urban	2,195	37.3	24.3	17.9	10.1	5.3	2.7	2.4
Rural-nonfarm ..	1,530	30.5	21.5	18.0	12.3	7.9	4.8	5.0
Rural-farm	2,335	24.5	18.1	16.5	13.2	10.1	7.3	10.3
Children								
Negro children	4,879	-	10.9	14.6	15.4	14.6	12.9	31.6
The North								
Urban	604	-	16.2	19.7	18.6	16.2	11.3	19.0
The South								
Urban	1,000	-	16.1	19.4	18.1	15.1	11.5	19.8
Rural-nonfarm ..	723	-	12.1	15.9	16.4	15.3	13.0	27.3
Rural-farm	2,424	-	6.9	11.0	13.1	14.0	13.8	41.2
Native-white children	31,622	-	14.5	22.0	19.7	15.2	10.9	17.7
The North								
Urban	9,364	-	19.2	27.4	21.0	13.6	8.1	10.7
The South								
Urban	3,118	-	17.1	25.2	21.2	15.0	9.5	12.0
Rural-nonfarm ..	2,849	-	11.6	19.4	19.8	17.0	12.9	19.3
Rural-farm	5,641	-	7.5	13.6	16.4	16.7	15.1	30.7

^a/ Number of families by number of children under 10, using 6 for the last group.

^b/ In private families only. For Negroes this includes 97 per cent of the total number of children under 10 years of age and 91 per cent of those under 21 years of age.

^c/ Number of families by number of children under 21, 7 being used for children 6-8 and 9 for those 9 and over.

Source: Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. VI, pp. 18-21 and State tables 9 and 10.

Appendix table 18.- Per Cent Distribution of Normal Families, by Number of Children under 21 Years of Age, by Residence, Age of Head, and Color, 1930

Residence and age of head	Negro					Native white									
	Total number of families					Per cent of families with specified number of children under 21 years of age					Total number of families				
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	0	1	2	3	4 or more	0	1	2	3	4 or more
United States total															
Under 25	176,000	44.4	29.9	16.0	6.4	3.3					905,000	44.9	37.3	13.6	3.3
25-34	515,000	34.1	20.8	16.0	12.0	17.1					4,335,000	24.6	29.2	23.9	12.5
35-44	522,000	31.5	17.8	12.6	9.9	28.2					4,655,000	17.4	20.5	22.4	15.5
45-54	434,000	33.2	17.2	11.6	9.2	28.6					3,486,000	28.6	21.9	17.5	11.8
55-64	217,000	35.5	18.5	12.6	9.4	20.9					2,187,000	52.3	21.7	11.8	6.5
65 and over	106,000	50.6	19.0	11.5	7.1	11.8					1,297,000	76.6	13.3	5.5	2.4
Urban															
Under 25	57,000	47.6	28.5	15.1	6.0	2.8					453,000	49.1	36.0	11.7	2.5
25-34	253,000	41.6	21.8	15.1	10.1	11.4					2,477,000	29.3	31.5	22.9	10.1
35-44	264,000	41.1	20.1	12.9	9.0	16.9					2,571,000	21.7	24.0	24.2	14.4
45-54	185,000	46.3	19.7	11.4	7.6	15.0					1,792,000	35.2	24.5	17.8	10.3
55-64	73,000	54.0	19.3	10.3	6.5	9.9					1,055,000	59.8	21.3	10.1	4.7
65 and over	30,000	63.6	17.6	8.7	4.6	5.5					559,000	80.7	12.0	4.5	1.7
Rural-nonfarm															
Under 25	34,000	44.5	30.7	15.7	6.1	3.0					225,000	40.4	39.0	15.6	3.9
25-34	89,000	33.5	21.4	16.6	12.5	16.9					981,000	20.5	27.7	25.1	14.6
35-44	84,000	30.3	18.7	13.1	10.2	27.7					971,000	15.0	19.1	22.1	16.5
45-54	66,000	34.3	18.8	12.5	9.2	25.2					711,000	27.4	21.8	17.6	12.4
55-64	34,000	43.1	19.9	12.1	8.7	16.2					462,000	53.2	21.9	11.6	6.3
65 and over	19,000	57.1	18.9	10.2	5.9	7.9					334,000	79.8	12.0	4.6	2.0
Rural-farm															
Under 25	66,000	42.3	30.5	16.6	6.9	3.7					227,000	41.0	38.2	15.5	4.0
25-34	173,600	23.9	19.1	17.0	14.5	25.5					877,000	15.7	24.3	26.2	17.2
35-44	173,000	17.3	13.8	12.0	11.0	43.9					1,112,000	9.4	13.5	18.6	17.3
45-54	131,000	19.5	14.1	12.0	10.8	43.6					983,000	17.6	17.2	16.7	14.2
55-64	110,000	26.9	17.6	14.3	11.5	29.7					670,000	39.8	22.3	14.8	9.5
65 and over	57,000	41.6	19.7	13.4	8.9	16.4					406,000	58.5	16.1	7.6	3.8

Source: Unpublished tabulations, U. S. Bureau of the Census.

Appendix table 19.- Per Cent Distribution of Normal and Broken Families in Urban Areas with Specified Number of Children under 21 Years of Age, by Color and Number of Lodgers, 1930

Number of children under 21 years of age	Negro					Native white					
	Total number of families	Per cent having specified number of lodgers				Total number of families	Per cent having specified number of lodgers				
		0	1	2	3 or more		0	1	2	3 or more	
Normal families											
No children	863,000	81.2	9.7	4.9	4.2	8,912,000	92.0	5.2	1.6	1.2	
1 child	386,000	77.6	11.3	5.9	5.2	3,222,000	90.4	5.9	2.0	1.7	
2 children	180,000	80.9	10.0	4.9	4.2	2,292,000	92.2	5.1	1.6	1.1	
3 children	112,000	83.3	8.9	4.3	3.5	1,694,000	92.8	4.8	1.4	1.0	
4 children or more	73,000	85.5	7.9	3.7	2.9	875,000	93.3	4.5	1.3	0.9	
	112,000	89.4	6.1	2.6	1.9	829,000	94.2	3.9	1.1	0.8	
Broken families											
Man head	129,000	70.2	15.5	7.4	6.9	715,000	85.7	9.0	2.9	2.4	
No children	100,000	67.6	16.5	8.1	7.8	541,000	84.5	9.7	3.1	2.7	
1 child	13,000	74.5	13.9	6.2	5.4	85,000	88.3	7.6	2.3	1.8	
2 children	7,000	79.8	11.8	4.6	3.8	46,000	90.1	6.6	2.0	1.3	
3 children or more	9,000	83.9	9.7	3.7	2.7	43,000	91.5	5.9	1.6	1.0	
Woman head	334,000	67.5	17.5	7.7	7.3	1,688,000	79.2	12.1	4.4	4.3	
No children	177,000	61.6	19.7	9.4	9.3	1,110,000	77.8	12.9	4.7	4.6	
1 child	69,000	69.7	17.0	6.9	6.4	284,000	80.1	11.4	4.2	4.3	
2 children	40,000	74.6	14.8	5.8	4.8	156,000	82.2	10.3	3.7	3.8	
3 children or more	48,000	80.1	12.1	4.3	3.5	138,000	85.2	8.9	3.0	2.9	

Source: Unpublished tabulations, U. S. Bureau of the Census.

Appendix table 20. - Income and Relief Status of Families in Selected Cities, by Color, 1935/

City	Colored a/				White			
	Per cent of families with nonrelief incomes of		Number of families in sample	On relief	Per cent of families with nonrelief incomes of		Number of families in sample	On relief
	Less than \$1,000	\$1,000-\$1,999 or more			Less than \$1,000	\$1,000-\$1,999 or more		
THE NORTH								
Metropolises								
New York, N.Y.	2,415	42.0	26.5	28.6	4.9	42,875	13.6	25.7
Philadelphia, Pa.	4,407	47.7	34.4	16.7	1.2	26,995	12.7	18.1
Chicago, Ill.	2,876	36.3	31.9	27.6	4.2	34,041	11.8	21.8
Detroit, Mich.	1,282	34.2	30.2	31.4	4.2	18,775	10.8	20.3
Large Cities								
Boston, Mass.	1,254	28.4	33.6	34.0	4.0	25,960	15.9	21.2
Buffalo, N.Y.	587	61.3	32.2	15.1	1.4	22,102	19.0	20.8
Trunkton, N.Y.	436	61.5	25.7	11.4	1.4	6,987	18.4	18.9
Newark, N.J.	1,634	55.5	23.3	21.9	1.3	12,259	16.7	16.8
Pittsburgh, Pa.	1,680	61.8	33.0	13.6	1.4	17,696	19.3	16.2
Cincinnati, Ohio	1,582	61.3	29.4	8.5	0.8	10,760	17.0	17.7
Cleveland, Ohio	2,592	56.5	29.1	13.6	0.8	28,099	20.0	12.5
Columbus, Ohio	757	49.0	37.4	13.1	0.6	9,609	13.6	17.3
St. Louis, Mo.	3,629	46.4	37.8	14.7	1.1	19,619	10.1	15.8
Middle-sized cities								
Lima, Ohio	379	54.4	34.0	11.1	0.5	10,769	17.6	11.0
Springfield, Mo.	587	29.3	60.8	9.6	0.3	16,562	14.4	12.6
Small cities								
Bridgton, N.J.	401	52.4	34.1	12.6	1.0	3,623	15.3	14.1
THE SOUTH								
Large Cities								
Richmond, Va.	4,054	16.2	70.3	12.6	0.9	7,559	6.6	27.5
Atlanta, Ga.	4,022	53.6	61.6	4.5	0.3	6,317	16.2	24.6
Birmingham, Ala.	3,629	34.6	60.5	4.6	0.4	7,213	13.5	24.7
New Orleans, La.	5,043	40.8	53.7	5.1	0.4	7,970	13.4	16.4
Dallas, Tex.	1,654	20.6	70.4	8.2	0.8	8,947	6.3	21.3
Houston, Tex.	2,489	20.4	67.6	11.6	0.4	6,630	6.2	26.0
Middle-sized cities								
Montgomery, Ala.	4,712	24.2	70.0	5.4	0.4	4,972	14.1	25.4
Monroe, La.	3,107	14.5	82.4	3.0	0.1	3,685	12.0	23.3
Wichita Falls, Tex.	1,277	23.1	72.6	3.6	0.3	9,221	12.1	16.7

Appendix table 20. - Income and Relief Status of Families in Selected Cities, by Color, 1935^a (continued)

City	Number of families in sample	Colored ^{a/}								
		Per cent of families With nonrelief incomes of			Number of families in sample	Per cent of families With nonrelief incomes of				
		On relief	Less than \$1,000	\$1,000-\$1,999 or more		On relief	Less than \$1,000	\$1,000-\$1,999 or more		
Small cities										
Corvington, Va.	228	7.4	80.3	11.4	0.9	4.4	31.0	45.8	18.8	\$1,505
Farwell, Va.	310	16.8	73.9	9.3	-	4.8	26.2	42.2	26.8	1,080
Brunswick, Ga.	1,335	16.7	80.1	3.0	0.2	11.3	41.1	30.9	16.7	1,505
Bufile, Ala.	674	7.1	92.1	0.6	0.2	3.3	58.0	31.0	7.7	835
Cadaden, Ala.	1,406	21.8	73.4	4.8	-	15.7	35.5	33.6	9.2	1,060
Greenville, Ala.	478	15.1	84.5	0.4	-	7.2	48.9	30.7	13.2	960
Abbeville, La.	315	18.7	73.7	1.6	-	14.3	43.8	22.9	13.2	865
Bossier, La.	262	7.6	91.6	0.8	-	11.9	34.3	45.3	9.5	1,160
Kinden, La.	567	26.8	72.3	0.9	-	12.7	36.4	36.8	15.1	1,170
THE WEST										
Metropolis										
Los Angeles, Calif.	805	39.0	35.3	23.5	2.2	11.6	25.9	42.9	19.6	1,470

^{a/} Families classified as "colored" are predominantly Negro. In Los Angeles, Calif., and Houston, Tex., they include only Negroes.

Median incomes for nonrelief colored families are not shown. In most cities they would be well below \$1,000. In such cases they cannot be computed with sufficient accuracy.

Sources: U. S. Public Health Service. The National Health Survey 1935-1936, Preliminary Reports, Population Series, Bulletin Nos. A and C, Washington, 1938.

Appendix table 21.—Income of Families in Selected Cities, by Color, 1933

City	Negro a/					White				
	Number of families in sample	Per cent of families with incomes of				Number of families in sample	Per cent of families with incomes of			
		Less than \$500	\$500-\$999	\$1,000-\$1,999	\$2,000 or more		Less than \$500	\$500-\$999	\$1,000-\$1,999	\$2,000 or more
Trenton, N. J.	225	54.7	30.2	12.9	2.2	25.9	27.4	32.6	14.1	
Cleveland, Ohio	2,189	53.8	32.2	12.9	1.1	26.1	23.3	32.3	18.3	
Topeka, Kans.	287	47.0	33.5	17.8	1.7	20.0	25.7	35.3	19.0	
Richmond, Va.	1,402	52.6	37.7	9.1	0.6	9.9	14.9	39.8	35.4	
Asheville, N. C.	386	61.1	32.4	6.5	-	20.9	28.7	33.2	17.2	
Greensboro, N. C. . . .	355	55.2	37.8	7.0	-	8.4	26.3	36.2	29.1	
Charleston, S. C. . . .	1,287	77.7	17.0	4.6	0.7	13.4	21.9	38.5	26.2	
Columbia, S. C.	689	75.7	20.6	3.5	0.2	16.7	20.5	31.6	31.2	
Atlanta, Ga.	3,999	63.7	29.1	6.3	0.9	13.6	18.4	36.6	31.4	
Jacksonville, Fla. . . .	1,615	73.3	23.9	2.8	-	18.3	23.2	37.2	21.3	
Paducah, Ky.	527	80.0	15.0	4.0	1.0	31.4	22.5	33.4	12.7	
Birmingham, Ala. . . .	2,880	80.4	16.3	3.2	0.1	23.9	22.3	35.7	18.1	
Jackson, Miss.	328	80.5	16.5	2.1	0.9	15.4	17.6	38.6	28.4	
Little Rock, Ark. . . .	841	75.1	19.0	5.4	0.5	20.1	20.0	34.8	25.1	
Baton Rouge, La. . . .	357	67.7	26.6	5.1	0.6	13.9	18.1	37.5	30.5	
Oklahoma City, Okla. . .	385	65.2	24.2	9.3	1.3	19.1	20.7	39.1	21.1	
Austin, Tex.	274	57.3	34.7	6.5	1.5	16.3	20.3	35.9	27.5	

a/ In 10 of the 17 cities the families classified as "Negro" include a few families of other races..

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce,
 Consumer Use of Selected Goods and Services, by Income Classes,
 Market Research Series, No. 5, Washington, 1935-1937.

Appendix table 22.- Family Incomes among Employed Wage Earners and Lower-salaried Clerical Workers in Selected Cities in One Year during the Period 1934-36, by Color

City	Negro			White		
	Number of families in sample	Average income		Number of families in sample	Average income	
		Median	Mean		Median	Mean
New York, N. Y.	100	\$1,326	\$1,446	697	\$1,638	\$1,745
Philadelphia, Pa.	101	1,116	1,203	498	1,467	1,601
Pittsburgh, Pa.	97	1,001	1,071	346	1,468	1,503
Cincinnati, Ohio	100	976	1,010	352	1,446	1,523
Indianapolis, Ind.	101	960	990	203	1,404	1,523
St. Louis, Mo.	106	1,114	1,162	401	1,529	1,552
Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans.	103	1,019	1,086	357	1,398	1,443
Baltimore, Md.	107	936	990	419	1,381	1,437
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.	109	884	939	162	1,660	1,614
Richmond, Va.	96	847	929	192	1,495	1,585
Louisville, Ky.	74	887	969	197	1,236	1,308
Memphis, Tenn.	94	780	821	194	1,440	1,459
Birmingham, Ala.	101	767	828	202	1,390	1,441
Mobile, Ala.	94	721	759	146	1,383	1,417
Jackson, Miss.	100	706	784	150	1,441	1,541
New Orleans, La.	83	780	841	318	1,260	1,302

Sources: Faith M. Williams and Alice C. Hanson, Money Disbursements of Wage Earners and Clerical Workers in Twelve Cities of the South, 1934-36, Bulletin No. 640, Tables 3 and 29; Money Disbursements of Wage Earners and Clerical Workers in the North Atlantic Region, 1934-36, Bulletin No. 637, Vol. I, Tables 1 and 18, and Vol. II, Tables 6 and 29; Money Disbursements of Wage Earners and Clerical Workers in Eight Cities in the East North Central Region, 1934-36, Bulletin 636, Tables 6 and 29; and Money Disbursements of Wage Earners and Clerical Workers in Five Cities in the West North Central - Mountain Region, 1934-36, Bulletin No. 641, Tables 1 and 27, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, 1939-1940.

Appendix table 23. - Per Cent Distribution of Sharecroppers and Other Share Tenants on Plantations According to Amount of Annual Subsistence Advance, by Color, 1934

Amount of subsistence advance	Total		Negro		White	
	Sharecroppers	Other share tenants	Sharecroppers	Other share tenants	Sharecroppers	Other share tenants
Total families - - - - -	2,734	599	2,394	478	340	121
Per cent distribution						
Total - - - - -	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than \$25 - - - - -	3.3	2.5	3.1	1.7	4.7	5.8
\$25-\$49 - - - - -	15.1	10.2	15.0	9.0	15.9	14.9
\$50-\$74 - - - - -	24.6	17.5	25.0	18.4	20.6	14.0
\$75-\$99 - - - - -	19.7	19.0	19.9	20.1	18.2	14.9
\$100-\$124 - - - - -	15.5	16.4	15.2	16.7	18.2	14.9
\$125-\$149 - - - - -	7.9	7.2	8.2	8.4	5.9	1.5
\$150-\$174 - - - - -	5.6	7.5	5.8	6.9	4.1	9.9
\$175-\$199 - - - - -	2.3	5.7	2.3	5.4	3.0	6.6
\$200 or more - - - - -	6.0	14.0	5.5	13.4	9.4	17.5

Source: Work Projects Administration, Division of Research. Unpublished data from study of landlord and tenant on the cotton plantation, 1934.

Appendix table 24. - Source of Income of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Southeastern Villages, by Color, 1935-36

Source of Income	North Carolina - Mississippi villages		South Carolina - Georgia villages	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
Total income	\$522	\$2,428	\$432	\$1,579
Per cent distribution				
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Principal earner	71.8	78.1	71.1	74.2
Supplementary earnings ...	16.1	6.6	16.4	11.7
Eonearned income	2.5	7.5	2.3	6.0
Home-produced food	6.9	3.6	6.7	4.2
Imputed income from housing	2.7	4.2	3.5	3.9

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 375, Tables 114, 128, 129, 149, 160, and 161.

Appendix table 25. - Per Cent Distribution of Native-born, Normal Farm and Village Families in the Southeast, a/
by Relief Status and Nonrelief Income and by Size, Type, and Color, 1935-36

Normal families by size and type	Negro						White					
	Number of families in sample	Per cent of families with nonrelief incomes of			Median income of non- relief families	Number of families in sample	Per cent of families with nonrelief incomes of			Median income of non- relief families		
		On relief	Less than \$500	\$500-\$1,000	\$1,000-\$2,000		On relief	Less than \$500	\$500-\$1,000			
Farm operators <u>b/</u>												
Families consisting of												
2 members	166	5.4	60.5	26.6	7.3	-	7.7	21.5	39.0	22.2	9.6	\$ 760
3-4 members	296	3.3	45.0	35.4	11.7	0.6	12.5	11.2	34.6	29.0	12.5	965
5 members or more	668	6.0	24.9	50.1	17.4	1.6	16.4	5.4	29.6	33.6	14.6	1,130
Families consisting of												
2 adults and	73	2.1	54.0	31.9	11.5	0.5	10.6	16.5	40.7	25.6	6.6	815
1 child under 16	69	5.6	40.6	36.6	17.0	-	14.9	13.3	38.4	24.3	9.2	800
2 children under 16	75	1.9	54.7	37.7	5.7	-	16.5	10.0	36.3	25.6	9.6	915
3-4 children under 16												
Sharecroppers												
Families consisting of												
2 members	334	4.0	76.3	16.6	1.1	-	8.1	44.3	41.2	6.4	-	515
3-4 members	658	3.0	67.0	27.9	2.1	-	9.4	35.0	44.1	11.5	-	580
5 members or more	953	5.4	43.6	44.4	6.6	-	17.2	16.4	46.9	17.5	-	780
Families consisting of												
2 adults and	233	2.3	76.1	21.5	0.1	-	7.4	47.9	37.2	7.5	-	490
1 child under 16	163	2.7	73.1	24.2	-	-	9.8	30.0	50.0	10.2	-	600
2 children under 16	165	3.2	64.1	32.1	0.6	-	9.3	34.2	43.9	12.6	-	585
3-4 children under 16												
Villages												
Families consisting of												
2 members	1,113	19.2	61.9	15.8	2.6	0.3	11.7	8.2	21.5	35.2	20.4	1,320
3-4 members	1,116	20.1	55.3	20.4	3.6	0.6	13.5	5.0	21.5	35.1	24.9	1,395
5 members or more	796	24.7	46.3	24.3	3.5	1.2	21.2	2.6	19.0	31.6	25.6	1,535
Families consisting of												
2 adults and	401	16.5	59.6	21.0	2.6	0.1	10.7	6.3	23.9	35.6	20.3	1,300
1 child under 16	229	15.8	63.1	19.5	1.7	0.9	12.9	6.1	25.2	34.7	21.1	1,295
2 children under 16	221	23.0	55.8	17.2	2.7	1.7	16.0	3.7	26.3	37.5	14.3	1,235
3-4 children under 16												

a/ Farm and village samples were taken in Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Mississippi. In this table triple weight was given the Georgia and South Carolina samples.

b/ White farm operators include self-sufficing farm families in North Carolina.

Sources: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 276, Part 1, Table 15, and Miscellaneous Publication No. 462, Tables 47 and 51.

Appendix table 26 - Per Cent Distribution of Native-born, Normal Families in Selected Cities, by Relief Status and Nonrelief Income and by Size, Type, and Color, 1935-36

Normal families by size and type	Number of fam- ilies in sample	Negro					Median income of non-fam- ilies in sample	Number of fam- ilies in sample	White					Median income of non- relief- families		
		Per cent of families							Per cent of families							
		With nonrelief incomes of							With nonrelief incomes of							
		On relief	Less than \$500	\$500-\$1,000	\$1,000-\$2,000	\$2,000-\$3,000 or more			On relief	Less than \$500	\$500-\$999	\$1,000-\$2,000	\$2,000-\$3,000 or more			
Columbia, S. C.																
Families consisting of 2 members	615	14.1	32.7	44.6	7.6	1.0	-	\$575	972	6.9	2.0	12.0	36.9	21.4	20.8	\$1,900
3-4 members	967	19.9	26.3	40.1	11.8	1.3	0.6	625	2,374	6.4	1.4	12.6	33.2	24.2	22.2	1,990
5-6 members	445	20.2	17.3	44.3	14.4	3.6	0.2	695	1,017	10.8	1.2	11.8	27.6	22.7	25.9	2,160
7 members or more	277	32.5	12.3	38.3	13.7	2.5	0.7	750	502	17.9	0.6	17.0	31.8	18.2	14.5	1,725
Families consisting of 2 adults and 1 child under 16	376	18.9	30.6	39.6	10.1	0.8	-	590	777	3.7	2.0	16.9	39.2	25.7	12.5	1,725
2 children under 16	189	22.2	32.7	37.6	6.4	1.1	-	555	603	6.3	1.2	15.2	35.3	22.6	19.4	1,860
3-4 children under 16	174	20.7	17.3	53.4	7.5	1.1	-	645	353	9.6	2.3	19.3	32.4	19.5	16.9	1,710
Families consisting of 3 adults and 1 or no other	392	19.6	19.1	41.9	16.1	1.9	1.4	705	994	8.6	0.9	7.8	27.2	24.0	31.5	2,380
5-6 adults	44	t	t	t	t	t	t	t	134	8.2	0.7	5.2	14.9	22.4	48.6	3,090
Mobile, Ala.																
Families consisting of 2 members	1,154	17.3	41.3	35.0	5.6	0.8	-	500	1,069	7.3	6.9	21.4	41.7	14.0	8.7	1,350
3-4 members	1,326	22.6	32.0	35.1	8.5	1.6	0.2	570	2,530	7.5	4.6	20.8	37.8	17.5	11.8	1,515
5-6 members	551	30.7	24.3	32.8	10.0	2.2	-	625	1,289	11.4	3.0	15.8	36.6	19.7	13.5	1,680
7 members or more	339	33.0	15.9	31.6	14.5	3.8	1.2	715	516	18.6	5.1	14.5	30.4	19.4	12.0	1,685
Families consisting of 2 adults and 1 child under 16	483	19.0	37.8	35.9	6.2	1.1	-	530	784	6.9	4.5	23.8	41.1	15.4	8.3	1,390
2 children under 16	260	33.1	33.9	26.5	5.3	1.2	-	495	626	6.7	4.3	26.1	40.7	13.6	8.6	1,325
3-4 children under 16	247	34.4	32.5	27.1	4.4	1.6	-	505	450	13.1	4.4	22.7	39.5	14.0	6.3	1,535
Families consisting of 3 adults and 1 or no other	603	20.9	26.7	38.1	11.6	2.2	2.5	625	1,120	8.4	5.0	15.5	33.8	21.3	16.0	1,735
5-6 adults	34	t	t	t	t	t	t	t	175	5.7	0.6	6.2	31.5	25.7	30.3	2,305

Atlanta, Ga.																
Families consisting of																
2 members	1,757	26.9	18.0	38.5	14.8	1.4	0.4	710	3,494	9.1	3.8	13.5	56.1	23.6	13.9	1,790
3-4 members	2,126	31.2	13.0	37.0	15.0	2.9	0.9	780	7,001	10.2	1.9	11.4	35.3	23.9	17.3	1,906
5-6 members	993	39.0	9.1	32.5	14.8	3.6	1.0	820	2,880	19.0	1.5	11.3	28.7	20.3	19.2	1,965
7 members or more	651	46.2	6.5	28.3	14.9	3.2	0.9	860	948	36.1	1.8	10.2	25.4	14.0	12.5	1,755
Families consisting of																
2 adults and																
1 child under 16	614	29.8	14.5	42.8	9.0	3.3	0.6	\$685	2,389	7.8	2.1	12.2	42.8	22.9	12.2	\$1,745
2 children under 16	359	39.0	14.5	36.2	7.5	2.5	0.3	675	1,497	10.5	1.9	13.6	38.4	22.7	12.9	1,795
3-4 children under 16	345	41.7	12.8	36.8	5.8	0.9	-	655	981	23.1	2.4	16.7	34.6	14.6	8.6	1,500
Families consisting of																
3 adults and 1 or																
no other	1,153	29.6	11.7	34.1	20.6	2.8	1.2	855	3,115	11.8	1.7	9.7	28.1	25.4	23.3	2,140
5-6 adults	95	31.6	8.4	18.9	23.2	13.7	4.2	1,180	347	10.7	0.6	3.2	18.7	25.3	41.5	2,895
Columbus, Ohio																
Families consisting of																
2 members	742	31.9	5.0	23.7	30.2	3.1	0.1	990	5,598	8.2	4.0	15.5	43.7	19.0	9.6	1,580
3-4 members	754	38.7	3.2	24.2	29.7	3.3	0.9	1,055	8,764	10.0	1.1	10.6	41.2	22.3	14.8	1,805
5-6 members	353	50.7	2.3	13.0	22.9	3.7	1.4	1,090	3,089	17.5	0.5	7.8	37.2	20.2	16.8	1,890
7 members or more	200	54.0	0.5	21.5	21.0	2.5	0.5	1,030	1,005	32.4	0.2	6.2	28.9	18.3	14.0	1,950
Families consisting of																
2 adults and																
1 child under 16	222	36.5	4.1	30.6	23.9	4.0	0.9	965	2,719	8.0	0.8	13.2	48.8	18.7	10.5	1,635
2 children under 16	139	42.5	3.6	30.2	21.6	1.4	0.7	940	1,831	11.8	0.9	11.6	45.5	19.2	11.0	1,650
3-4 children under 16	161	49.7	3.1	24.8	20.5	1.9	-	960	1,161	20.9	0.3	11.3	45.9	13.3	8.3	1,560
Families consisting of																
3 adults and 1 or no	393	39.7	2.5	18.3	35.9	3.6	1.0	1,155	4,204	10.5	1.4	8.5	34.3	26.1	19.2	2,015
other	35	t	t	t	t	t	t	t	377	10.9	0.2	4.0	24.1	23.1	37.7	2,665
5-6 adults																

t Fewer than 50 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletins No. 644 and 647, Vol. 1, Tabular Summary, Sec. B, Table 1.

Appendix table 27. - Average Quantity of Specified Foods Consumed at Home during One Week, March-November, 1936, by Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Southern Farm Counties, $\frac{g}{g}$ by Color, Sexure, Family Type, $\frac{B}{B}$ and Income

Color, tenure, family type, and income	Average quantities consumed										
	Beef (lbs.)	Pork		Poul- try (lbs.)	Fish and other sea food (lbs.)	Eggs (doz.)	Fluid milk (qts.)	Fats (lbs.)	Potatoes (lbs.)	Sugar (lbs.)	Flour, meals, cereals (lbs.)
		Fresh (lbs.)	Cured (lbs.)								
Negro farm operators and All groups	1.0	0.4	3.6	1.7	1.9	0.8	11.6	3.9	5.1	3.6	27.6
Family type I	0.5	0.4	2.5	1.5	1.4	0.7	8.0	3.1	3.1	2.9	18.0
II-III	0.9	0.4	2.9	1.2	1.9	0.6	9.8	3.6	4.0	3.4	21.9
IV-V	1.0	0.6	3.8	1.9	2.2	0.9	13.0	4.3	5.4	4.0	29.1
VI-VII	1.3	0.4	4.7	1.8	2.0	0.7	13.7	4.2	7.3	4.0	38.5
Less than \$500	0.7	0.3	2.8	1.1	1.5	0.6	9.3	3.3	2.9	3.1	25.1
\$500-\$999	1.0	0.5	4.1	2.0	2.2	0.8	12.6	4.3	6.0	4.1	29.7
\$1,000-\$1,499	1.8	1.1	4.9	2.6	2.8	1.2	16.0	5.0	10.8	4.3	30.3
\$1,500-\$1,999	(1.7)	(1.1)	(5.5)	(3.1)	(2.6)	(1.3)	(22.1)	(5.4)	(10.6)	(4.5)	(28.4)
\$2,000 or more	t	t	t	t	t	t	t	t	t	t	t
White farm operators	1.3	0.6	4.8	3.2	1.4	1.7	23.7	5.5	8.8	5.1	28.7
Family type I	1.1	0.5	3.4	2.8	0.9	1.4	15.6	4.1	4.8	3.9	19.3
II-III	1.0	0.5	4.1	2.9	1.3	1.5	21.6	5.1	7.3	4.6	23.7
IV-V	1.4	0.5	5.2	3.3	1.6	2.0	25.1	5.9	8.6	5.4	30.3
VI-VII	1.7	1.0	5.7	3.4	1.9	1.6	30.1	6.6	14.4	5.8	39.3
Less than \$500	0.5	0.2	3.1	2.0	0.9	1.0	19.1	4.1	4.4	3.7	25.7
\$500-\$999	0.8	0.4	4.0	2.6	1.2	1.4	24.0	5.4	7.3	4.7	28.8
\$1,000-\$1,499	1.4	0.7	5.2	3.4	1.6	1.8	24.0	5.6	11.0	5.4	30.4
\$1,500-\$1,999	1.8	0.7	6.1	4.0	1.8	2.2	26.1	6.2	11.3	5.5	30.5
\$2,000 or more	2.7	1.2	6.3	4.4	1.9	2.5	24.5	6.3	10.8	6.1	27.4
White sharecroppers	1.0	0.6	4.1	2.5	1.7	1.2	17.5	4.8	7.0	4.4	27.2
Family type I	0.8	0.8	3.0	2.1	1.3	1.1	11.8	4.0	4.9	3.4	17.9
II-III	0.9	0.4	3.7	2.4	1.6	1.1	14.0	4.1	5.6	4.0	21.5
IV-V	1.0	0.5	4.7	3.0	1.8	1.4	21.7	5.6	7.6	5.0	31.8
VI-VII	1.1	0.7	4.7	2.5	2.2	1.0	21.2	5.4	10.2	4.7	37.2
Less than \$500	0.6	0.2	2.7	1.8	1.1	0.8	17.0	4.0	4.1	3.9	25.3
\$500-\$999	0.9	0.5	4.2	2.4	1.6	1.2	19.3	5.0	7.2	4.3	28.1
\$1,000-\$1,499	1.6	1.0	6.0	3.9	2.6	1.6	15.8	5.1	9.4	4.9	27.2
\$1,500-\$1,999	1.6	1.6	5.7	3.9	3.1	2.2	16.3	5.6	13.2	5.4	28.3

t Fewer than 10 cases.

a/ Data for Negro farm operators and sharecroppers from 13 counties in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi; for white farm operators from 22 counties in the four states; and for white sharecroppers from 20 counties in the four states.

b/ For a description of family types, see p. 327.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 20 cases.

Sources: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 405, Table 53.

Appendix table 28.- Average Number of Times Daily Various Foods Appeared in the Diets of Negro and White School Children in Two Texas Counties, Spring and Winter, 1927-29

Food	Brazos county				Jefferson county			
	Spring		Winter		Spring		Winter	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Number of children	196	532	196	532	275	239	275	239
Milk	1.4	2.5	1.2	2.3	1.4	2.2	1.3	2.2
Butter	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.8	0.4	0.7	0.3	0.7
All fruits	0.7	1.4	0.8	1.3	1.0	1.5	0.7	1.2
Raw fruits	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.5
Citrus fruits	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2
All vegetables	0.9	1.7	1.2	1.5	1.3	1.9	1.3	1.6
Leafy vegetables	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
All cereals	3.7	4.1	3.7	4.1	4.4	3.9	4.5	4.1
Whole cereals	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.4
All proteins (other than milk) ..	2.1	2.4	2.2	2.4	2.6	2.3	2.7	2.4
Meat	1.3	1.2	1.6	1.5	1.7	1.2	1.8	1.3
Eggs	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.6
Cheese	*	0.1	0.1	0.1	*	0.1	0.1	0.1
Legumes	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.2
Nuts	*	0.1	0.2	0.1	*	0.1	*	0.1
Sweets	1.8	2.4	1.7	2.2	2.0	2.2	1.9	2.1
Coffee and tea	0.1	0.2	*	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2

*Less than 0.05 times.

Source: Jessie Whitacre, *The Diet of Texas School Children*, Bulletin No. 469, Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, Division of Rural Home Research, College Station, Texas, March, 1934, p. 25.

Appendix table 29.- Proportion of Native-born, Foreign-born, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Consumption of Specified Foods during One Week, March-December, 1936 ^a/ by Color, Family Type, and Income

Community group and color	All groups	Family type				Income						
		I	III-V			VI-VII	Less than \$500	\$500-\$999	\$1,000-\$1,499	\$1,500-\$1,999	\$2,000-\$2,999	\$3,000 or more
			IV-V									
Southern farm counties b/ Negro farm operators and sharecroppers												
Number of families in sample	1,564	266	357	602	339	730	657	149	20	6	2	
Per cent of families re- porting consumption of												
Fluid milk	66.3	68.8	65.5	67.9	62.2	65.5	65.1	71.1	t	t	t	
Eggs	66.4	68.0	63.3	69.6	62.8	57.4	71.2	83.9	t	t	t	
Fresh fruits	33.8	33.1	31.4	36.9	31.3	29.0	36.4	43.6	t	t	t	
Fresh vegetables	86.4	84.2	86.8	88.0	85.0	82.6	88.6	94.6	t	t	t	
Potatoes	52.0	49.6	51.5	53.3	51.9	40.3	57.2	80.5	t	t	t	
White farm operators												
Number of families in sample	2,350	382	511	1,018	439	279	916	523	270	222	140	
Per cent of families re- porting consumption of												
Fluid milk	86.8	88.2	86.3	89.3	91.1	84.2	88.9	89.3	90.7	90.1	90.0	
Eggs	86.6	89.0	85.5	90.0	88.6	78.9	85.9	92.7	94.8	91.9	92.9	
Fresh fruits	66.3	63.4	71.8	64.0	67.7	49.8	59.4	72.5	74.1	79.3	86.7	
Fresh vegetables	91.7	88.5	91.2	92.0	94.3	87.1	89.0	94.1	94.8	96.4	96.4	
Potatoes	73.8	70.4	74.4	75.2	72.7	54.8	68.1	80.7	79.3	86.0	92.9	
White sharecroppers												
Number of families in sample	878	140	292	276	170	236	462	134	46	-	-	
Per cent of families re- porting consumption of												
Fluid milk	74.1	65.7	75.0	80.1	70.0	79.7	74.2	66.4	67.4	-	-	
Eggs	82.8	89.3	82.5	81.2	80.6	76.7	83.1	88.1	95.7	-	-	
Fresh fruits	52.8	52.1	59.9	48.9	47.6	44.5	52.8	64.2	65.0	-	-	
Fresh vegetables	91.0	92.9	90.8	90.2	91.2	90.7	89.8	94.8	93.5	-	-	
Potatoes	70.2	67.5	70.5	72.1	68.2	57.2	71.4	81.3	91.3	-	-	

Appendix table 29.- Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Consumption of Specified Foods during One Week, March-December, 1936, ^a/ by Color, Family Type, and Income
(continued)

Community group and color	All groups	Family type					Income				
		I	II-III	IV-V	VI-VII	Less than \$500	\$500- \$999	\$1,000- \$1,499	\$1,500- \$1,999	\$2,000- \$2,999	\$3,000 or more
Fluid milk	90.7	89.9	93.8	88.0	-	-	71.8	87.3	94.0	94.2	97.5
Eggs	96.2	97.6	98.1	93.9	-	-	92.8	94.0	97.0	97.6	97.7
Fresh fruits	94.9	96.1	95.4	93.6	-	-	85.1	93.7	95.9	96.9	98.8
Fresh vegetables	98.3	96.1	99.3	98.9	-	-	97.5	96.2	99.1	98.8	99.3
Potatoes	91.1	86.5	91.3	94.1	-	-	85.8	91.2	91.6	91.1	94.2

^t Fewer than 25 cases.

^a/ Data for rural families apply to one week during the period March-November, 1936; data for urban families apply to one week during the period May-August, 1936.

^b/ Data for Negro farm operators and sharecroppers from 13 counties in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi; for white farm operators from 22 counties in the four states; and for white sharecroppers from 20 counties in the four states.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. II, Tabular Summary, Table 4; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 405, Tables 48, 51, and 52, and Miscellaneous Publication No. 452, Tables 30, 33, and 34.

Appendix table 30. - Proportion of Husbands and of Wives Reporting Expenditures for Specified Items of Clothing in Columbia, S. C., Mobile, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga., by Income and Color, 1935-36

Item	Income									
	Negro					White				
	Less than \$500	\$500-\$999	\$1,000-\$1,499	\$1,500-\$2,999	\$3,000 or more	Less than \$500	\$500-\$999	\$1,000-\$1,499	\$1,500-\$2,999	\$3,000 or more
Per cent of husbands reporting expenditures for										
Headwear	33	61	70	84	73	-	64	76	86	93
Coats and other wraps	14	26	34	49	64	-	28	30	38	46
Trousers - wool	6	15	19	27	0	-	16	17	15	16
cotton	11	23	19	11	0	-	37	41	33	24
Overalls or coveralls	30	32	26	2	9	-	40	31	12	2
Shirts	67	82	86	84	82	-	82	84	90	94
Underwear, nightwear, hose ..	71	92	94	98	82	-	90	96	95	98
Shoes - work	45	49	40	44	45	-	54	41	29	17
street	35	64	73	87	73	-	65	75	84	92
Ties	12	28	43	42	36	-	33	55	70	76
Per cent of wives reporting expenditures for										
Headwear	50	74	85	91	90	-	70	88	94	97
Coats and other wraps	17	37	48	49	90	-	34	42	48	62
Dresses - silk or rayon	17	46	54	64	70	-	43	56	72	83
cotton - street	28	46	47	42	60	-	47	51	53	65
house	21	25	27	31	30	-	35	35	38	41
Hose - rayon or silk	67	89	96	98	100	-	68	95	97	97
cotton	18	11	7	2	0	-	7	9	3	4
Shoes - street	12	72	76	78	100	-	78	82	87	87
dress	14	38	46	60	50	-	25	33	48	56
sport	4	14	14	7	20	-	7	12	14	13
Purses, handkerchiefs, etc. .	5	25	31	51	70	-	28	45	59	66

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 646, Vol. III, Table 9 and Tabular Summary, Table 4, and unpublished data.

Appendix table 31. - Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Expenditures for Specified Toilet Articles, and Proportion of Husbands and Wives in These Families Reporting Expenditures for Barbershop or Beauty-parlor Services, by Color, 1935-36

Item	Per cent reporting specified expenditures									
	Georgia-Mississippi farm operators		North Carolina-South Carolina farm operators		Georgia-Mississippi sharecroppers		34 southern villages		Four small southern cities a/	
	Negro White		Negro White		Negro White		Negro White		Negro White	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Dentifrices	34	74	54	82	26	59	58	93	74	97
Cosmetics	74	89	79	90	70	82	77	95	80	94
Brushes, combs, razors, files ...	48	61	63	75	45	55	56	76	68	84
Personal services										
Husbands	44	66	52	80	40	44	80	94	85	96
Wives	11	33	2	27	8	17	20	65	21	68

a/ Albany, Ga.; Gastonia, N. C.; Sumter, S. C.; and Griffin, Ga.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 455, Table 12.

Appendix table 32. - Per Cent Distribution of Negro and White Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Atlantic, Ga., According to the Expenditure for Medical Care, by Income, 1935-36

Income	All families	No expenditure reported	Less than \$10	\$10-\$19	\$20-\$29	\$40-\$59	\$60-\$79	\$80-\$99	\$100-\$199	\$200-\$299	\$300-\$399	\$400 or more
Negro families												
Less than \$250	100	(29)	(25)	(24)	(3)	(13)	-	-	(6)	-	-	-
\$250-\$499	100	15	25	16	33	7	1	2	1	-	-	-
\$500-\$749	100	4	20	12	20	28	11	3	2	-	-	-
\$750-\$999	100	2	11	5	31	25	8	7	11	-	-	-
\$1,000-\$1,249	100	-	12	3	26	23	16	6	13	-	-	-
\$1,250-\$1,499	100	3	4	5	15	25	16	15	15	1	-	-
\$1,500-\$1,749	100	-	7	12	13	7	18	17	17	1	-	-
\$1,750-\$1,999	100	9	13	-	10	17	3	24	9	3	6	-
White families												
\$500-\$749	100	8	56	16	12	4	4	-	-	-	-	-
\$750-\$999	100	2	29	18	13	17	3	6	10	2	-	-
\$1,000-\$1,249	100	4	16	21	27	14	1	14	3	-	-	-
\$1,250-\$1,499	100	5	11	11	27	10	10	4	17	4	*	1
\$1,500-\$1,749	100	-	9	3	23	18	10	8	23	4	1	1
\$1,750-\$1,999	100	1	4	13	21	11	14	7	18	7	2	2

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

Note: Figures in parentheses are based on 24 cases.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. V, Table 1, p. 5.

Appendix table 33.- Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Receiving Some Free Medical Care, by Income and Color, 1935-36

Per cent of families reporting some free medical care												
Income			Georgia-Mississippi		North Carolina- South Carolina		34 southern villages		Atlanta, Ga.		New York, N. Y.	
			Farm operators		Share-croppers		Share-croppers					
			Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
All incomes	2.3	3.1	1.6	5.0	1.6	2.5	2.6	5.1	27.8	10.5	20.2	8.8
Less than \$500	2.4	4.5	1.8	3.4	3.4	5.5	2.2	3.2	40.2	-	-	-
\$500-\$999	2.5	2.2	1.0	6.1	0.6	2.3	3.3	4.3	28.3	35.7	34.2	11.9
\$1,000-\$1,499	1.6	3.7	-	-	-	1.7	1.8	4.6	18.6	18.7	14.3	16.3
\$1,500-\$1,999	-	1.9	-	-	-	1.6	-	4.7	4.5	9.6	25.9	5.4
\$2,000-\$2,999	-	3.5	-	-	-	-	-	6.2	11.7	4.7	8.1	6.9
\$3,000 or more	-	4.8	-	-	-	-	-	7.8	t	5.5	t	8.9

t Fewer than 25 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. V, Tabular Summary, Tables 1 and 3; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 402, Table 35.

Appendix table 34. - Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Expenditures for Specified Types of Medical Care, by Color and Income, 1935-36

Per cent of families reporting expenditures for specified types of medical care									
Color and income	Georgia-Mississippi farm operators			Four small southern cities a/			Atlanta, Ga.		
	Physician	Dentist	Medicine and drugs	Physician	Dentist	Medicine and drugs	Physician b/	Dentist	Medicine and drugs
Negro families									
Less than \$500	53	12	90	50	12	82	24	11	78
\$500-\$999	63	18	94	69	29	89	38	15	89
\$1,000-\$1,499	80	23	95	68	32	92	45	23	93
\$1,500-\$1,999	-	-	-	t	t	t	60	12	83
\$2,000-\$2,999	-	-	-	-	-	-	59	28	95
\$3,000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	t	t	t
White families									
Less than \$500	58	18	91	64	9	85	-	-	-
\$500-\$999	71	30	90	69	27	90	49	33	92
\$1,000-\$1,499	71	34	95	81	41	93	66	53	90
\$1,500-\$1,999	71	49	98	73	57	94	76	58	96
\$2,000-\$2,999	78	49	95	79	66	97	78	61	91
\$3,000 or more	71	49	90	80	67	90	76	71	92

t Fewer than 25 cases.

Albany, Ga.; Gastonia, N. C.; Sumter, S. C.; and Griffin, Ga.

Includes specialists other than dentists and oculists.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 418, Vol. V, Tabular Summary, Table 3; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 402, Table 35.

Appendix table 35.—Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Health and Accident Insurance and Average Premium Payment for Families Reporting Such Insurance, by Income and Color, 1935-36

Income	Georgia-Mississippi counties				34 southern villages				Columbia, S.C., and Mobile, Ala.		Atlanta, Ga.		New York, N. Y.	
	Farm operators		Share-croppers		Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
	Negro	White	Negro	White										
Per cent of families reporting health and accident insurance														
Less than \$500	22	0	14	1	34	3	51	12	55	12	5	7	-	-
\$500-\$999	22	7	17	2	42	12	66	17	78	12	16	12	12	7
\$1,000-\$1,499	19	2	-	-	44	17	66	16	86	32	24	13	24	13
\$1,500-\$1,999	-	4	-	-	-	13	74	20	67	29	24	19	19	13
\$2,000-(\$2,499) _a / \$2,999	-	3	-	-	-	22	70	24	57	36	22	22	22	19
(\$2,500) _a / \$3,000 or more	-	4	-	-	-	23	t	28	t	31	t	32	t	32
Average premium payment														
Less than \$500	\$8	*	\$8	*	\$17	*	\$19	\$6	\$22	\$9	*	*	-	-
\$500-\$999	14	*	16	*	25	\$21	36	14	36	10	\$25	\$20	\$20	16
\$1,000-\$1,499	19	*	-	-	38	28	44	16	44	15	22	22	22	16
\$1,500-\$1,999	-	*	-	-	-	51	52	25	52	20	21	21	22	22
\$2,000-\$2,999	-	*	-	-	-	46	49	27	56	45	tt	tt	tt	47
\$3,000 or more	-	*	-	-	-	61	tt	35	(67)	45	tt	tt	tt	47

* The average premium payment was not computed when less than 10 per cent of the families reported health and accident insurance.

t Fewer than 25 cases.

tt Fewer than 10 cases.

Note: The figure in parentheses is based on 23 cases.

a/ For Atlanta and New York the income classes are \$1,500-\$2,249 and \$2,250-\$2,999.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. V, Tabular Summary, Table 3; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 402, Table 35.

Appendix table 36.- Average Expenditure of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities for Specified Types of Recreation, by Income and Color, 1935-36

Type of recreation and income	Georgia-Mississippi counties				34 southern villages		Atlanta, Ga.		New York, N. Y.	
	Farm operators		Sharecroppers							
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Reading a/	\$ 2	\$ 7	\$ 1	\$ 2	\$ 3	\$15	\$10	\$19	\$16	\$27
All incomes	1	2	1	1	2	3	5	-	-	-
Less than \$500	2	4	1	2	5	7	9	10	9	12
\$500-\$999	3	6	-	-	11	12	12	13	13	15
\$1,000-\$1,499	-	6	-	-	-	16	20	17	20	22
\$1,500-\$1,999(\$2,249)b/	-	15	-	-	-	22	24	21	27	29
\$2,000(\$2,250)b/- \$2,999	-	25	-	-	-	31	(42)	34	t	46
\$3,000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tobacco	12	17	12	11	15	31	17	42	33	51
All incomes	10	10	10	10	11	16	9	-	-	-
Less than \$500	12	12	15	12	19	21	17	21	23	20
\$500-\$999	17	17	-	-	28	30	26	32	29	36
\$1,000-\$1,499	-	20	-	-	-	37	18	44	42	47
\$1,500-\$1,999(\$2,249)b/	-	30	-	-	-	38	28	46	46	56
\$2,000(\$2,250)b/- \$2,999	-	41	-	-	-	44	(42)	62	t	74
\$3,000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Movies and other admissions	1	6	1	1	4	19	6	24	21	41
All incomes	1	1	1	1	2	4	1	-	-	-
Less than \$500	1	2	1	2	6	9	5	9	6	12
\$500-\$999	2	7	-	-	14	16	11	13	16	17
\$1,000-\$1,499	-	10	-	-	-	21	15	22	31	31
\$1,500-\$1,999(\$2,249)b/	-	19	-	-	-	29	20	31	46	42
\$2,000(\$2,250)b/- \$2,999	-	41	-	-	-	39	(46)	49	t	62
\$3,000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Games and sports equipment c/	1	3	1	1	2	4	1	6	1	9
All incomes	1	1	1	1	2	4	1	-	-	-
Less than \$500	1	1	1	1	2	4	1	1	1	2
\$500-\$999	1	3	-	-	2	3	2	2	2	1
\$1,000-\$1,499	-	3	-	-	-	5	4	5	2	4
\$1,500-\$1,999(\$2,249)b/	-	5	-	-	-	6	4	7	6	6
\$2,000(\$2,250)b/- \$2,999	-	10	-	-	-	15	(7)	20	t	31
\$3,000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other recreation d/	1	12	1	3	4	21	10	26	19	36
All incomes	1	3	2	2	2	5	3	-	-	-
Less than \$500	2	5	2	4	6	8	7	11	9	6
\$500-\$999	3	10	-	-	13	14	13	15	15	11
\$1,000-\$1,499	-	13	-	-	-	22	21	22	27	20
\$1,500-\$1,999(\$2,249)b/	-	25	-	-	-	31	36	28	29	34
\$2,000(\$2,250)b/- \$2,999	-	55	-	-	-	57	(57)	71	-	98
\$3,000 or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Less than \$0.50.

t Fewer than 10 cases.

a/ Excludes books and journals purchased for use at school or for occupational use.

b/ For Atlanta and New York the income classes are \$1,500-\$2,249 and \$2,250-\$2,999.

c/ Excludes special clothing for sportswear.

d/ Excludes food used when entertaining, and food and lodging when on vacation or trips.

Notes: Figures in parentheses are based on 23 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 646, Vol. VII, Tabular Summary, Tables 3, 4, and 6; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 396, Tables 40 and 48, and Miscellaneous Publication No. 465, Tables 36 and 39.

Appendix table 37.- Proportion of Native-born, Nonrelief, Normal Families in Selected Communities Reporting Contributions for Support of Relatives, by Income and Color, 1935-36

Income	Per cent of families reporting contributions for support of relatives											
	Georgia-Mississippi		North Carolina-South Carolina Sharecroppers		34 southern villages		Atlanta, Ga.		Columbus, Ohio		New York, N. Y.	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
All incomes	10	9	9	6	14	15	20	25	8	14	29	22
Less than \$500	7	1	5	7	7	3	6	-	t	-	-	-
\$500-\$999	10	5	12	6	22	6	20	14	6	5	8	5
\$1,000-\$1,499	19	9	8	8	31	12	41	18	9	10	34	8
\$1,500-\$1,999	-	15	-	6	-	17	29	22	12	12	30	12
\$2,000-\$2,999	-	14	-	-	-	19	35	31	29	16	42	24
\$3,000 or more	-	26	-	-	-	30	t	35	-	24	t	42

t Fewer than 25 cases.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 648, Vol. VII, Tabular Summary, Table 7; and U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Publication No. 455, Table 14. .

Appendix table 38.- Farmhouses in 11 Southern States, by Age of House and Color of Operator, 1934

State	Per cent of dwellings occupied by nonwhite farm operators by age of house				Per cent of dwellings occupied by white farm operators by age of house			
	Less than 10 years	10-24 years	25-49 years	50 years or more	Less than 10 years	10-24 years	25-49 years	50 years or more
11 states, total	14.2	35.4	38.1	12.3	18.8	30.5	33.2	17.5
Owners	19.1	37.0	33.9	10.0	20.9	29.9	32.0	17.2
Nonowners	13.0	34.9	39.2	12.9	16.5	31.1	34.6	17.8
Maryland	6.1	14.1	41.6	38.2	6.9	12.6	28.9	51.6
Virginia	14.3	35.1	32.8	17.8	12.7	26.2	30.9	30.2
North Carolina	12.2	32.4	36.4	19.0	18.7	31.1	31.1	19.1
South Carolina	8.8	38.6	41.6	11.0	15.9	35.0	35.1	14.0
Georgia	6.4	32.8	49.2	11.6	11.6	30.3	41.9	16.2
Florida	27.4	38.3	30.6	3.7	41.1	36.6	18.5	3.8
Tennessee	14.2	32.6	34.7	18.5	16.4	28.8	34.5	20.3
Alabama	16.7	34.5	37.4	11.4	19.8	34.6	35.7	9.9
Mississippi	19.3	40.3	33.5	6.9	24.9	29.6	34.6	10.9
Arkansas	17.2	44.5	33.4	4.9	21.7	34.4	32.1	11.8
Louisiana	19.8	27.4	38.9	13.9	24.7	31.7	33.0	10.6

Source: Unpublished data, Farm-Housing Survey, 1934.

Appendix table 39.- Farmhouses in 11 Southern States, by Condition of Doors and Windows and Color of Operator, 1934

Tenure	Per cent of dwellings occupied by nonwhite farm operators with doors and windows in specified condition			Per cent of dwellings occupied by white farm operators with doors and windows in specified condition		
	Good	Fair	Poor	Good	Fair	Poor
11 states, Total	12.5	34.7	52.5	36.1	37.4	26.5
Owners	19.5	34.9	45.3	46.0	35.9	18.1
Nonowners	10.9	34.7	54.4	25.3	39.0	35.7

Source: Unpublished data, Farm-Housing Survey, 1934.

Appendix table 40. - Farmhouses in 11 Southern States, by Condition of Screens and Color of Operator, 1934

States	Per cent of dwellings occupied by nonwhite farm operators with screens in specified condition				Per cent of dwellings occupied by white farm operators with screens in specified condition			
	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Reported	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Reported
11 states, total	2.9	6.0	14.6	76.5	23.6	20.8	18.6	37.0
Owners	6.8	10.8	18.2	64.2	32.1	24.7	17.1	26.1
Nonowners	1.9	4.8	13.6	79.7	14.2	16.5	20.2	49.1
Maryland	22.9	33.4	22.4	21.3	59.1	30.2	6.8	3.9
Virginia	9.9	13.3	19.3	57.5	41.2	20.6	13.6	24.6
North Carolina	1.5	5.2	13.9	79.4	17.9	24.1	17.8	40.2
South Carolina	1.3	2.4	6.1	90.2	16.6	14.6	15.3	53.5
Georgia	1.1	2.2	5.4	91.3	15.3	14.0	15.0	55.7
Florida	2.2	5.8	24.9	67.1	28.4	24.4	25.3	21.9
Tennessee	6.2	13.1	21.9	58.8	26.6	24.2	18.4	30.8
Alabama	2.2	3.0	4.0	90.8	16.6	18.5	16.3	48.6
Mississippi	1.2	7.2	16.3	75.3	15.0	21.5	20.4	43.1
Arkansas	3.1	6.0	38.3	52.6	20.3	24.0	32.4	23.3
Louisiana	1.6	4.1	10.6	83.7	17.3	14.1	22.2	46.4

Source: Unpublished data, Farm-Housing Survey, 1934.

Appendix table 41.- Farmhouses in 11 Southern States with Specified Toilet Facilities, by Color of Operator, 1934

State	Per cent of dwellings occupied by nonwhite farm operators with specified facilities			Per cent of dwellings occupied by white farm operators with specified facilities		
	Chemical	Flush	Septic tank a/	Chemical	Flush	Septic tank a/
11 states, total ..	*	0.2	0.1	0.1	5.5	3.1
Owners	*	0.4	0.2	0.2	8.1	4.7
Nonowners	*	0.1	0.1	*	2.6	1.4
Maryland	-	1.1	0.5	0.3	16.4	5.0
Virginia	*	0.5	0.3 *	0.2	9.5	4.1
North Carolina ..	-	0.1	0.3	0.1	4.2	2.9
South Carolina ..	*	*	*	*	3.1	2.6
Georgia	*	*	*	0.1	2.2	0.9
Florida	-	2.1	1.5	0.2	24.6	20.2
Tennessee	*	0.1	-	0.1	2.4	1.2
Alabama	*	0.1	*	*	1.4	0.6
Mississippi	*	0.1	*	0.1	3.5	1.3
Arkansas	*	0.1	*	0.1	1.8	1.3
Louisiana	-	0.1	*	0.1	3.0	0.5

*Less than 0.05 per cent.

a/ Operators sometimes confused septic tanks with cesspools.

Source: Unpublished data, Farm-Housing Survey, 1934.

Appendix table 42. - Farmhouses in 11 Southern States with Specified Bathroom Facilities and with Kitchen Sinks with Drains, by Color of Operator, 1934

State	Per cent of dwellings occupied by nonwhite farm operators with specified facilities				Per cent of dwellings occupied by white farm operators with specified facilities			
	Bathroom	Bathtub	Lavatory	Kitchen sink with drain	Bathroom	Bathtub	Lavatory	Kitchen sink with drain
11 states, total ..	0.6	0.2	0.2	0.5	9.5	6.5	5.6	11.5
Owners	1.6	0.5	0.4	0.8	14.0	9.7	8.4	16.5
Nonowners	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.4	4.5	2.9	2.5	5.9

Source: Unpublished data, Farm-Housing Survey, 1934.

Appendix table 43. - Farmhouses in 11 Southern States Lighted by Gas or Electricity, by Color of Operator, 1934

State	Per cent of dwellings occupied by nonwhite farm operators lighted by gas or electricity				Per cent of dwellings occupied by white farm operators lighted by gas or electricity			
	Gas		Electricity		Gas		Electricity	
	Acetylene	Piped	Home plant	Power line	Acetylene	Piped	Home plant	Power line
11 states, total ...	0.1	*	0.1	0.5	1.5	0.2	2.7	8.1
Owners	0.4	0.1	0.3	1.3	2.5	0.4	4.3	11.6
Nonowners	0.1	*	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.9	4.3

* Less than 0.05 per cent.

Source: Unpublished data, Farm-Housing Survey, 1934.

Appendix table 44. - Farmhouses in 11 Southern States with Specified Kind of Cooking Stove, by Color of Operator, 1934

State	Per cent of dwellings occupied by nonwhite farm operators with specified kind of cooking stove		Per cent of dwellings occupied by white farm operators with specified kind of cooking stove	
	Kerosene or gasoline	Gas or electricity	Kerosene or gasoline	Gas or electricity
11 States, total	1.0	*	11.8	1.3
Owners	1.9	*	15.1	2.0
Nonowners	0.3	*	8.2	0.4

* Less than 0.05 per cent.

Source: Unpublished data, Farm-Housing Survey, 1934.

Appendix table 45. - Number and Per Cent of Farms in Continental United States and 16 Southern States Receiving Central-station Electric Service, 1934 and 1940

State	Farms reported by census, January 1, 1935	Farms receiving central-station service, December 31, 1934 ^{a/}		Farms receiving central-station service, June 30, 1940		Per cent increase in electrified farms from December 31, 1934, to June 30, 1940 ^{b/}
		Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	
United States total	6,812,350	743,954	10.9	1,871,994	27.1	151.6
Alabama	273,455	11,053	4.0	39,900	14.0	261.0
Arkansas	253,013	2,943	1.2	14,624	5.8	396.9
Delaware	10,381	1,791	17.3	4,656	41.1	160.0
Florida	72,857	5,700	7.8	9,500	11.8	66.7
Georgia	250,544	6,956	2.8	48,900	19.2	603.0
Kentucky	278,298	8,480	3.0	36,100	12.0	325.7
Louisiana	170,216	2,826	1.7	16,180	9.1	472.5
Maryland	44,501	6,791	15.3	16,687	37.7	145.7
Mississippi	311,683	2,802	0.9	24,500	7.6	774.4
North Carolina	300,967	2,672	3.2	80,600	25.0	733.3
Oklahoma	213,325	5,648	2.6	17,500	8.5	209.8
South Carolina	165,504	3,796	2.3	30,400	18.3	700.8
Tennessee	273,783	9,727	3.6	31,000	10.7	218.7
Texas	501,017	11,466	2.3	70,668	14.7	516.3
Virginia	197,632	14,954	7.6	49,300	24.8	229.7
West Virginia	104,747	3,647	3.5	20,827	18.3	471.1

^{a/} Edison Electric Institute, Statistical Bulletin, No. 4.

^{b/} Data from REA surveys. Percentages computed on basis of farm population estimates.

^{c/} Reclassification and abandonment of farms and the fact that the Edison Electric Institute figures on farms receiving central-station service tend in most states to exceed those shown in REA surveys make the percentage increase in farms electrified conservative and in some instances result in appreciable understatement.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, 1940, Washington, 1941, p. 54.

Appendix table 46 - Selected Characteristics of Urban Households by Geographic Regions,
p/ 1934-36

Item	Total	Subtotal except New York City	New York City	North- east	South- east	North- west	South- west	Califor- nia
Number of places reporting	200	199	1	132	21	35	8	3
Number of dwelling units re- ported (in thousands)	8,307	6,240	2,067	4,151	596	1,076	211	205
Per cent distribution by number of rooms								
1 room	39.9	1.5)	55.8	1.0	2.0	3.1	2.8	1.4
2 rooms		5.4)		3.7	9.0	8.4	9.0	9.6
3 rooms		10.9)		8.7	20.8	11.9	17.4	14.5
4 rooms	22.2	16.6)	19.4	15.7	18.9	17.7	22.1	19.9
5 rooms		23.3)		22.5	18.9	26.8	25.0	29.8
6 rooms		22.5)		26.0	16.0	15.9	12.9	14.9
7 rooms or more	37.9	19.8)	24.8	22.4	14.4	16.2	10.8	10.1
Per cent of dwellings with 6 or more persons in household	16.0	16.6	14.2	18.0	18.8	12.4	15.0	7.3
Extra (doubled-up) families as per cent of all families	5.5	6.0	4.0	5.8	8.9	5.1	8.6	2.9
Per cent of dwelling with More than 1 person per room ..	17.4	16.6	20.2	15.5	25.8	15.0	23.9	9.1
More than 2 persons per room ..	1.2	1.3	0.8	0.9	3.5	1.1	3.5	0.5
Per cent of dwellings considered to be								
In need of major repairs	-	14.1	-	12.8	20.0	15.0	15.8	11.8
Unfit for use	-	2.3	-	2.3	3.4	1.7	2.6	1.4
Per cent of dwelling units								
Without private indoor flush toilet	14.8	15.4	12.1	12.2	32.1	18.6	25.3	6.6
Without running water	-	5.3	-	3.5	12.8	6.7	14.9	1.1
Without private bath	19.9	21.6	15.0	19.5	41.0	20.7	26.1	8.0
Without central heating	-	41.3	-	31.8	76.1	40.5	94.0	81.0
Without electricity or gas for cooking	13.1	16.8	1.7	10.6	49.1	23.9	22.8	5.8
Per cent of homes occupied by tenants	56.8	52.2	70.7	53.1	53.0	48.1	56.7	50.5
Per cent distribution by monthly rental of tenant-occupied dwelling units								
Less than \$10.00	7.6	10.3	1.6	5.7	38.1	11.9	21.2	4.2
\$10.00 - \$19.99	26.1	32.1	12.6	30.3	33.4	37.7	36.2	34.3
\$20.00 - \$29.99	26.3	28.6	21.2	31.1	14.6	26.3	23.2	35.6
\$30.00 - \$49.99	29.1	22.7	43.5	25.4	11.0	20.0	16.1	21.1
\$50.00 - or more	10.9	6.3	21.1	7.5	2.9	4.1	3.3	4.8

a/ "Northeast" includes New England, East North Central, and Middle Atlantic states, and Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, and West Virginia. "Southeast" includes the rest of the South Atlantic states, the East South Central states, and Louisiana.

"Northwest" includes the West North Central and the Mountain and Pacific states except Arizona, New Mexico, and California. "Southwest" includes Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico.

Source: Peyton Stapp, Urban Housing, A Summary of Real Property Inventories Conducted as Work Projects, 1934-1936. Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, passim.

Appendix table 47. - Proportion of Households in Selected Cities Having Specified Toilet Facilities, by Color, Income, and Relief Status, 1935-36

Groups of cities	Total number of households in sample	Colored		White		White Nonrelief		
		Relief	Nonrelief	Relief	Nonrelief	Less than \$1,000	\$1,000-2,000	2,000-3,000 or more
a/								
Total number of households in sample								
Southern cities of less than 10,000	403		2,248	407	1,833	1,403	333	330
Southern cities of 10,000-25,000	573		2,523	1,189	3,283	2,805	626	363
Southern cities of 25,000-50,000	2,098		7,778	3,600	7,956	10,605	3,256	2,459
Southern cities of 50,000-100,000	6,235		15,139	4,602	11,565	19,691	6,492	4,306
Eastern cities of 100,000-500,000	4,590		5,853	21,540	27,901	59,459	18,445	10,514
Central cities of 500,000 or more	4,630		6,012	13,650	23,971	45,430	12,242	5,257
Per cent of dwelling units with private inside flush toilets								
Southern cities of less than 10,000	6.2		9.6	39.8	58.8	89.7	97.6	97.6
Southern cities of 10,000-25,000	18.5		35.3	47.4	70.9	90.3	96.8	96.6
Southern cities of 25,000-50,000	11.6		25.5	64.2	85.5	96.2	99.2	99.6
Southern cities of 50,000-100,000	32.4		52.7	74.1	84.1	95.8	99.0	99.6
Eastern cities of 100,000-500,000	80.3		90.2	84.4	98.5	96.5	99.3	99.7
Central cities of 500,000 or more	67.7		77.0	81.4	95.4	95.1	98.8	99.5
Per cent of dwelling units with communal toilets								
Southern cities of less than 10,000	4.6		9.9	4.2	2.3	1.3	0.3	-
Southern cities of 10,000-25,000	7.5		3.6	5.5	3.3	1.6	1.2	0.6
Southern cities of 25,000-50,000	23.8		19.6	8.3	5.9	1.6	0.5	0.1
Southern cities of 50,000-100,000	25.8		16.2	13.3	9.6	2.5	0.6	0.3
Eastern cities of 100,000-500,000	9.8		5.6	10.5	8.1	2.7	0.5	0.2
Central cities of 500,000 or more	27.2		20.5	13.3	11.1	3.7	0.8	0.3

a/ Southern cities of less than 10,000 include Abbeville, La.; Bufala, Ala.; Farmville, Va.; Greenville, Ala.; and Minden, La. Southern cities of 10,000-25,000 include Brunswick, Ga.; Covington, Va.; Gadsden, Ala.; Montgomery, Ala.; and Weatherford, Tex. Southern cities of 25,000-50,000 include Amarillo, Tex.; Monroe, La.; Tulsa, Okla.; and Wichita Falls, Tex. Southern cities of 50,000-100,000 include Atlanta, Birmingham, Dallas, Houston, New Orleans, and Richmond ("colored" in Dallas includes some Mexicans; in Houston, Mexicans are excluded). Eastern cities of 100,000-500,000 include Boston, Buffalo, New York, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh. Central cities of 500,000 or more include Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, and St. Louis.

b/ Households for which income was not reported are included in the figures for total relief and nonrelief, but are omitted in the nonrelief income classification. Households for which the kind of toilet used was not reported are included in totals, but are omitted from the figures on different toilet facilities. The discrepancy thus introduced is in the neighborhood of 0.1 per cent.

Sources: U. S. Public Health Service, The National Health Survey, 1935-1936, Preliminary Reports, Sickness and Medical Care Series, Bulletin No. 5, Washington, 1938, Table.

Appendix table 48. - Type of Heating Apparatus in Dwelling Units in Selected Cities, by Color and Tenure, 1933

City	Per cent of dwelling units with specified type of heating											
	Negro owners				Negro tenants				White owners			
	Heating stove	Central heating plant a/	Other b/	Heating stove	Heating stove	Central heating plant a/	Other b/	Heating stove	Heating stove	Central heating plant a/	Other b/	Heating stove
Trenton, N. J.	t	t	t	68.9	28.5	80.8	2.6	19.1	36.8	63.0	0.1	36.8
Cleveland, Ohio	31.1	68.9	-	74.7	24.8	86.3	0.5	13.6	24.9	74.8	0.1	24.9
Topeka, Kan.	76.5	23.5	-	92.0	8.0	63.6	-	36.0	49.4	50.5	0.4	49.4
Richmond, Va.	96.0	3.6	0.4	99.2	0.5	69.9	0.3	29.1	1.0	57.1	1.0	41.7
Wheeling, W. Va.	t	t	t	77.6	2.0	55.1	20.4	35.6	9.3	30.6	9.3	57.0
Asheville, N. C.	t	t	t	88.0	3.3	60.1	8.7	36.4	5.5	46.5	5.5	44.6
Greensboro, N. C.	t	t	t	84.4	-	63.5	15.6	29.5	7.0	29.8	7.0	41.3
Columbia, S. C.	52.2	2.6	45.2	22.8	3.7	42.7	73.5	37.6	39.6	23.2	19.7	39.6
Charleston, S. C.	90.3	0.9	8.6	83.5	-	10.2	16.5	76.3	84.8	1.8	13.5	84.8
Atlanta, Ga.	58.8	6.2	35.0	45.1	0.8	48.9	54.1	34.1	28.6	47.0	17.0	28.6
Jacksonville, Fla.	64.2	-	35.8	50.6	0.3	8.7	49.1	73.8	67.7	7.3	17.5	67.7
Paducah, Ky.	94.9	2.2	2.9	89.4	0.3	25.5	10.3	69.0	68.9	21.0	5.5	68.9
Birmingham, Ala.	38.2	1.1	60.7	12.3	0.2	40.1	87.5	34.1	25.8	36.9	25.8	27.2
Jackson, Miss.	t	t	t	11.1	-	5.4	88.9	90.4	4.2	5.1	4.2	87.5
Little Rock, Ark.	98.2	-	1.8	100.0	-	3.1	-	94.9	97.8	0.3	2.0	97.8
Baton Rouge, La.	14.3	0.9	84.8	26.6	-	4.0	73.4	79.4	74.2	5.3	16.6	74.2
Oklahoma City, Okla.	97.2	-	2.8	96.0	-	13.2	4.0	84.9	93.3	5.0	2.9	93.3
Austin, Texas	98.5	-	1.5	100.0	-	5.7	-	91.9	96.7	0.9	2.4	96.7
Dallas, Texas	83.4	16.6	-	100.0	-	3.2	-	96.7	98.7	1.2	0.1	98.7

t Fewer than 100 cases.

a/ Includes warm-air furnaces, steam or vapor, and hot-water heating plants.

b/ Probably fireplace.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Consumer Use of Selected Goods and Services, by Income Classes, Market Research Series, Nos. 5-12, Washington, 1935-1937.

Table 5.

Appendix table 49. - Proportion of Dwelling Units in Selected Cities Which Were Reported in Need of Major Repairs or Unfit for Use, by Color of Occupants and Number of Rooms

City	Year of inventory	Per cent of dwelling units in need of major repairs or unfit for use									
		Negro					White				
		All occupied dwelling units	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 or more	All occupied dwelling units	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 or more
Hartford, Conn.	1939	29.9	t	34.5	25.4	t	2.5	1.3	4.5	1.6	0.5
Harrisburg, Pa.	1939	72.8	t	84.1	78.9	62.9	13.6	16.7	13.2	16.3	11.5
Detroit, Mich.	1939	33.7	38.0	42.7	30.0	28.1	5.8	7.6	7.4	5.2	5.4
Chicago, Ill.	1939-40	5.6	13.3	6.3	4.7	8.2	2.1	1.7	1.9	2.3	3.7
(Woodlawn area)	1939-40	66.5	t	75.9	63.9	48.8	14.8	25.4	15.2	15.3	11.2
Alexandria, Va.	1936	41.4	54.0	48.5	27.8	t	20.4	27.5	26.0	19.1	6.8
Martinsville, Va.	1936	25.2	48.0	28.1	18.0	15.0	4.8	8.0	6.1	4.2	4.3
Norfolk, Va.	1936	41.7	56.2	41.4	28.3	29.4	17.8	39.8	21.2	12.8	10.5
Spartanburg, S. C.	1939	56.5	73.9	53.5	32.9	29.4	18.6	34.5	24.4	9.1	6.2
Augusta, Ga.	1939	54.7	73.0	58.6	40.7	33.4	11.0	24.4	19.1	6.8	2.9
Savannah, Ga.	1939										

t Fewer than 100 cases.

Source: Unpublished tabulations, Real Property Inventories, Federal Housing Administration.

Appendix table 50. - Number of Rooms per Dwelling Unit in Selected Cities, by Color of Occupants

City	Year of inventory	Number of dwelling units reported	Per cent distribution of occupied units by number of rooms per unit								
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 or more	Unknown
Negro											
Hartford, Conn.	1939	1,888	0.1	0.9	13.4	38.5	34.9	7.9	1.9	1.9	0.6
Buffalo, N.Y.	1939	4,487	0.3	2.1	6.0	22.4	24.3	26.8	12.6	5.5	-
Philadelphia, Pa.	1939	62,170	2.8	15.6	13.0	10.6	12.9	21.7	8.8	14.6	-
Harrisburg, Pa.	1939	1,779	0.9	3.5	8.8	7.4	11.5	21.0	20.1	26.7	-
Chicago, Illinois (Woodlawn area)	1939-40	2,932	0.5	3.2	7.2	18.1	31.0	33.4	5.2	1.4	-
Detroit, Mich.	1939	29,667	1.5	3.8	10.1	19.1	29.6	23.3	7.5	6.1	-
Alexandria, Va.	1939-40	1,346	1.6	3.0	5.9	21.2	25.0	33.5	5.5	3.9	0.3
Martinsville, Va.	1936	688	6.2	14.0	24.1	19.0	13.7	12.5	3.9	6.4	0.2
Norfolk, Va.	1936	12,027	0.5	4.6	39.9	18.4	14.1	13.4	4.6	4.3	-
(Greater) Raleigh, N.C.	1939	3,593	0.9	6.5	33.7	28.9	15.3	7.5	3.2	4.0	-
Charlotte, N.C.	1939	2,076	0.9	4.0	37.7	28.9	16.5	6.0	2.4	3.6	-
Spartanburg, S.C.	1936	2,676	2.6	17.3	26.8	32.7	12.3	4.5	1.8	2.0	-
Augusta, Ga.	1939	8,060	12.0	16.9	43.6	13.7	7.7	4.0	1.2	1.0	-
Savannah, Ga.	1939	12,785	3.4	8.7	24.6	33.4	17.9	7.8	2.3	1.8	-
Birmingham, Ala.	1939-40	29,664	3.9	28.8	41.7	10.9	7.9	4.7	1.2	0.9	-
New Orleans, La.	1939-40	41,539	12.9	18.1	32.4	24.4	7.9	2.6	0.8	0.9	-
White											
Hartford, Conn.	1939	41,674	0.9	3.4	15.8	22.0	31.4	14.7	4.4	7.1	0.4
Buffalo, N.Y.	1939	146,135	0.3	2.0	5.5	13.1	20.7	36.3	13.2	8.9	-
Philadelphia, Pa.	1939	428,978	0.8	4.9	7.1	7.7	10.6	36.4	14.4	18.1	-
Harrisburg, Pa.	1939	21,668	1.0	4.0	7.1	7.4	9.8	23.4	13.2	34.0	-
Chicago, Illinois (Woodlawn area)	1939-40	18,032	11.7	21.0	13.7	15.9	15.8	13.5	5.3	3.1	-
Detroit, Mich.	1939	363,619	1.3	5.0	10.0	10.4	31.8	24.4	8.6	8.5	-
Alexandria, Va.	1939-40	6,720	0.7	4.6	9.4	10.7	20.6	29.7	10.3	13.5	0.5
Martinsville, Va.	1936	1,658	2.7	15.7	12.7	21.2	13.0	13.5	7.8	13.4	-
Norfolk, Va.	1936	21,358	0.3	2.8	8.3	15.7	25.1	25.2	11.3	15.4	-
(Greater) Raleigh, N.C.	1939	7,694	1.1	7.3	15.1	17.0	20.2	15.3	8.8	15.2	-
Charlotte, N.C.	1939	22,415	2.2	9.3	23.0	17.9	18.2	14.6	5.9	8.9	-
Spartanburg, S.C.	1936	4,898	2.2	8.7	13.7	15.9	22.8	17.7	7.7	11.3	-
Augusta, Ga.	1939	9,843	3.6	11.6	23.1	16.3	18.8	12.9	5.6	7.9	-
Savannah, Ga.	1939	13,199	1.1	4.9	14.3	17.3	22.8	20.3	8.6	10.3	0.1
Birmingham, Ala.	1939-40	40,648	1.7	8.2	16.0	14.8	19.6	21.7	9.7	8.3	-
New Orleans, La.	1939-40	88,699	2.6	6.4	13.1	27.8	25.3	12.6	5.9	6.4	-

* Less than 0.05 per cent.

Source: Unpublished tabulations, Real Property Inventories, Federal Housing Administration.

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Appendix table 51. - Proportion of Dwellings in Selected Cities with More than One Person per Room, by Color, Relief Status, and Income, 1935-36

City	Per cent of dwellings with more than 1 person per room						
	Colored		Relief	White			
	Relief	Non-relief		Less than \$1000	\$1,000-\$2,000	\$2,000-\$3,000	\$3,000 or more
The North							
Metropolises							
New York, N. Y.	27.6	14.9	36.9	18.1	20.8	17.1	12.7
Philadelphia, Pa. ..	29.6	13.2	27.8	9.0	7.7	6.1	2.6
Chicago, Ill.	34.5	21.6	30.3	14.2	15.1	12.3	10.4
Detroit, Mich.	25.7	14.5	29.5	11.7	10.9	7.6	6.0
Large cities							
Boston, Mass.	19.1	8.4	29.4	12.1	13.0	9.9	6.8
Buffalo, N. Y.	16.9	6.8	21.5	6.7	5.5	3.8	2.7
Trenton, N. J.	21.6	12.4	23.4	10.1	6.5	6.6	5.1
Newark, N. J.	33.1	15.6	43.9	17.7	17.7	14.4	11.0
Pittsburgh, Pa.	35.6	21.8	47.6	25.2	16.4	7.8	3.0
Cincinnati, Ohio ...	41.2	24.9	49.5	22.2	21.4	12.4	4.1
Cleveland, Ohio	27.0	8.6	26.5	8.7	8.3	8.3	6.2
Columbus, Ohio	22.6	12.3	28.8	6.3	5.6	4.2	2.9
St. Louis, Mo.	46.2	28.0	52.1	21.2	20.8	15.1	9.7
Middle-sized cities							
Lima, Ohio	14.6	6.3	15.7	4.6	4.9	2.3	1.6
Springfield, Mo. ...	27.3	14.1	51.6	21.7	12.6	5.2	3.4
Small cities							
Bridgeton, N. J. ...	31.9	9.0	22.5	5.6	4.6	1.9	4.1
The South							
Large cities							
Richmond, Va.	50.8	24.7	40.9	18.4	10.7	4.0	2.9
Atlanta, Ga.	56.2	39.7	55.8	27.0	13.7	5.8	7.0
Birmingham, Ala. ...	51.1	33.8	33.8	15.4	10.8	4.9	3.6
New Orleans, La. ...	49.8	33.0	44.4	20.7	17.5	8.6	5.7
Dallas, Tex.	54.8	27.6	65.5	28.6	14.7	7.5	4.8
Houston, Tex.	29.7	14.7	49.9	23.5	15.2	6.0	2.6
Middle-sized cities							
Montgomery, Ala. ...	53.9	33.6	56.9	30.2	16.7	6.3	5.2
Monroe, La.	57.3	35.8	51.8	29.2	18.5	6.0	5.9
Wichita Falls, Tex. ...	55.3	27.4	54.2	24.1	13.2	7.4	4.0
Small cities							
Covington, Va.		38.0	45.1	2 2.1	15.8		15.7
Farmville, Va.	46.2	30.1	8.7	7.3	9.5		5.5
Brunswick, Ga.	35.9	21.9	40.5	28.9	14.6	8.1	2.7
Bufala, Ala.	68.8	44.1	45.8	32.6	15.4		-
Gadsden, Ala.	59.6	47.0	61.8	41.5	26.5	12.9	3.7
Greenville, Ala. ...	62.6	41.0	32.5	37.6	11.0		5.4
Abbeville, La.	66.1	38.3	62.1	32.3	14.6		6.7
Bossier, La.		41.1	50.6	34.1	26.2		12.7
Minden, La.	35.5	27.8	44.9	19.6	12.7		4.3
The West							
Metropolis							
Los Angeles, Cal. ...	12.1	6.9	17.9	7.3	6.2	4.5	1.8

1/ Families classified as "colored" are predominantly Negro. In Los Angeles and Houston they include only Negroes.

Source: U. S. Public Health Service, *The National Health Survey, 1935-1936*, Preliminary Reports, Sickness and Medical Care Series, Bulletin No. 5, Washington, 1938, *passim*.

Appendix table 52. - Proportion of Families in Selected Cities Owning Homes, by Color.
1930 and 1933

City	Per cent of families owning homes					
	Negro			White		
	1930 (Census)	1933 (Real Property Inventories) a/	1933 (Consumer Use of Selected Goods and Services) b/	1933 (Census)	1933 (Real Property Inventories) a/	1933 (Consumer Use of Selected Goods and Services) b/
Trenton, N. J.	15.3	b/	15.6	56.0	b/	56.2
Cleveland, Ohio	8.3	b/	9.3	39.1	b/	45.7
Topeka, Kan.	57.3	b/	56.4	56.7	b/	55.2
Martinsville, Va.	b/	53.0	b/	b/	34.4	b/
Winchester, Va.	40.6	36.1	b/	47.5	42.7	b/
Hopewell, Va.	11.1	15.7	b/	24.5	36.1	b/
Portsmouth, Va.	29.4	27.1	b/	42.6	42.3	b/
Norfolk, Va.	21.4	18.1	b/	39.6	39.3	b/
Richmond, Va.	20.3	b/	17.5	38.7	b/	40.2
Asheville, N. C.	28.1	b/	22.3	41.6	b/	39.3
Greensboro, N. C.	31.0	b/	27.6	38.5	b/	33.0
Spartanburg, S. C.	25.0	19.1	b/	36.6	29.3	b/
Columbia, S. C.	19.9	b/	16.7	38.9	b/	35.3
Charleston, S. C.	10.2	b/	8.9	33.0	b/	31.6
College Park, Ga.	b/	18.8	b/	b/	48.8	b/
East Point, Ga.	b/	17.7	b/	b/	47.4	b/
Decatur, Ga.	10.6	9.4	b/	56.1	55.3	b/
Augusta, Ga.	18.5	15.3	b/	32.1	25.9	b/
Savannah, Ga.	10.2	10.1	b/	31.3	25.6	b/
Atlanta, Ga.	15.6	b/	14.8	36.2	b/	39.6
Jacksonville, Fla.	22.1	b/	9.3	38.8	b/	30.9
Paduach, Ky.	27.5	b/	26.0	40.1	b/	41.6
Louisville, Ky.	20.1	16.3	b/	45.5	41.3	b/
Birmingham, Ala.	17.8	b/	21.5	44.6	b/	43.7
Jackson, Miss.	25.0	b/	17.7	45.2	b/	46.1
Little Rock, Ark.	34.1	b/	32.5	45.5	b/	47.9
Baton Rouge, La.	33.5	b/	29.4	38.9	b/	30.5
Oklahoma City, Okla.	27.3	b/	28.3	36.6	b/	45.1
Austin, Texas	49.0	b/	50.0	48.0	b/	51.1
Dallas, Texas	24.9	b/	26.8	40.3	b/	49.5

a/ As per cent of families reporting tenure.

b/ Data not available.

Sources: Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. VI, State tables 4 and 21; Unpublished tabulations, Real Property Inventories, Federal Housing Administration; and U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Consumer Use of Selected Goods and Services, by Income Classes, Market Research Series, Nos. 5-12, Washington, 1935-1937 Table 5.

Appendix table 53. - Per Cent Distribution of Owner-occupied Residential Properties in Selected Cities, by Ratio of Debt (Principal Only) to Value and Color of Owner, January 1, 1934

Ratio of debt (principal only) to value	Cleveland, Ohio		Richmond, Va.		Atlanta, Ga.		Birmingham, Ala.	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Number reporting	163	13,742	100	951	274	2,042	325	1,692
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1-9 per cent	3.1	2.9	6.0	1.1	7.7	1.5	4.3	2.6
10-19 per cent	6.7	5.8	7.0	3.3	13.1	3.5	6.1	4.3
20-29 per cent	8.6	8.3	12.0	5.2	13.1	8.5	10.5	7.7
30-39 per cent	16.0	10.1	8.0	6.8	9.1	8.6	7.1	8.9
40-49 per cent	10.4	12.9	9.0	12.1	8.8	13.1	10.5	10.9
50-59 per cent	9.2	14.0	15.0	20.8	8.4	15.9	10.5	13.1
60-69 per cent	9.2	13.3	14.0	16.9	11.7	15.7	9.5	11.5
70-79 per cent	13.5	14.4	11.0	18.5	13.1	16.7	11.7	15.6
85-99 per cent	10.4	7.7	7.0	8.2	7.0	9.3	12.0	10.9
100 per cent or more	12.9	10.6	11.0	7.1	8.0	7.3	17.6	14.5

Source: David L. Wickens, *Financial Survey of Urban Housing*, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Washington, 1937, Table 74.

Appendix table 54. - Per Cent Distribution of First Mortgages on Owner-occupied Residential Properties in Selected Cities, by Agencies Holding the Mortgages and Color of Owner, January 1, 1934

Agencies holding the mortgages	Cleveland, Ohio		Atlanta, Ga.		Birmingham, Ala.	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Number reporting	166	13,543	275	2,047	317	1,641
All agencies holding first mortgage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Life insurance company	6.4	6.7	8.0	32.6	0.3	32.6
Building and loan association...	15.4	11.3	5.4	3.7	34.4	19.0
Commercial bank	37.2	44.2	3.6	2.4	1.6	3.7
Savings bank	21.1	20.3	19.3	3.5	2.2	0.7
Mortgage company	3.6	1.1	12.7	29.2	16.1	16.7
Construction company	-	0.3	1.1	0.2	0.6	0.2
Title and trust company	2.6	2.9	8.0	2.7	0.3	1.4
Home Owners' Loan Corporation ..	2.6	2.8	7.3	3.0	4.4	4.6
Individual	9.0	7.5	31.3	16.9	34.1	16.8
Other	1.9	2.9	3.3	3.6	6.0	4.3

Source: David L. Wickens, *Financial Survey of Urban Housing*, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Washington, 1937, Table 74.

Appendix table 55. - Per Cent Distribution of First Mortgages on Owner-occupied Residential Properties in Selected Cities, by Contract Interest Rate and Color of Owner, January 1, 1934

Contract interest rate	Cleveland, Ohio		Atlanta, Ga.		Birmingham, Ala.	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Number reporting	151	13,412	270	2,026	306	1,605
All rates	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than 5 per cent ..	-	0.7	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.6
5 per cent	3.3	5.0	10.0	4.6	6.5	7.1
5.1-5.9 per cent	-	0.4	-	4.7	0.3	2.2
6 per cent	69.5	74.7	10.0	33.9	6.5	28.0
6.1-6.9 per cent	-	2.5	0.7	6.6	1.0	11.2
7 per cent	18.6	14.6	23.7	35.0	5.9	18.4
7.1-7.9 per cent	-	0.5	0.4	0.3	-	1.7
8 per cent or more ...	8.6	1.6	54.8	14.5	78.8	30.8
Average contract rate (per cent) ..	6.32	6.13	7.21	6.60	7.56	6.80

Source: David L. Wickens, Financial Survey of Urban Housing, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Washington, 1937, Table 74.

Appendix table 87. - Per Cent Distribution of Tenant-occupied Dwelling Units in Selected Cities, by Number of Rooms, Color,^a and Monthly Rental ^{a/}

City and number of rooms per unit	Negro				White			
	Number of cases reported	Per cent distribution by monthly rental			Number of cases reported	Per cent distribution by monthly rental		
		Less than \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$20.00 or more		Less than \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$20.00 or more
Bartford, Conn.								
3 rooms	252	5.2	54.0	31.7	9.1	0.7	8.3	9.6
4 rooms	721	2.1	25.2	48.6	24.1	0.2	4.0	13.5
5 rooms	620	0.1	7.1	36.8	56.0	*	0.4	3.6
6 rooms	126	-	1.6	16.7	81.7	*	0.2	1.0
Harrisburg, Pa.								
3 rooms	155	18.1	52.9	20.6	8.4	1.1	3.2	7.5
4 rooms	127	14.2	47.2	18.1	20.5	1.1	4.7	6.5
5 rooms	190	4.7	49.5	32.6	13.2	0.6	7.2	12.2
6 rooms	309	1.9	29.8	45.6	22.7	0.2	5.8	18.0
Detroit, Mich.								
2 rooms	1,101	13.6	18.4	9.5	58.5	1.4	3.3	4.7
3 rooms	2,919	6.8	23.0	25.8	44.4	0.7	4.6	7.6
4 rooms	5,110	3.1	14.2	26.0	56.7	0.4	4.2	13.0
5 rooms	7,614	0.6	5.3	14.6	79.5	0.1	1.0	4.5
6 rooms	5,504	0.3	3.5	9.9	86.3	*	0.7	3.0
Chicago, Ill.								
(Woodlawn area.)								
2 rooms	2,176	0.3	1.5	4.8	93.4	0.1	1.8	4.2
3 rooms	202	-	4.5	15.3	60.2	0.1	0.3	1.2
4 rooms	487	0.2	1.9	8.6	89.3	-	*	0.5
5 rooms	654	-	0.3	2.3	97.4	-	-	0.6
6 rooms	625	-	-	0.3	99.7	-	-	0.2
Alexandria, Va.								
4 rooms	230	26.1	50.4	14.3	9.2	0.2	4.0	8.4
5 rooms	244	4.9	43.0	39.8	12.3	0.6	2.4	9.4
6 rooms	267	0.7	16.1	59.2	24.0	0.1	3.6	11.4
Savannah, Ga.								
2 rooms	1,083	96.1	3.1	0.8	-	38.0	31.5	16.3
3 rooms	3,082	91.8	4.9	0.2	0.1	27.4	36.5	16.0
4 rooms	4,044	81.6	17.1	1.4	-	10.7	33.1	27.7
5 rooms	1,680	40.1	50.4	6.0	1.5	2.8	12.8	25.5
6 rooms	673	19.3	46.8	24.5	9.4	0.5	4.8	12.7

* Less than 0.05 per cent.

^{a/} For year of inventory, see Table 81.

Source: Unpublished tabulations, Real Property Inventories, Federal Housing Administration.

Appendix table 58. - Per Cent of Negro Families among All Families on Relief, May, 1934, and in the Total Population, 1930, and Incidence of Relief by Color, May, 1934, in 30 Selected Cities ^{a/}

City	Per cent of Negro families among		Relief families, May 1934, as per cent of all families, 1930		City	Per cent of Negro families among		Relief families, May 1934, as per cent of all families, 1930	
	Relief families, May 1934	All families, 1930	Negro	White		Relief families, May 1934	All families, 1930	Negro	White
Northern cities	20.2	6.0	52.2	13.3	Border-state cities (cont.)				
Ansonia, Conn.	16.9	5.8	39.9	12.1	St. Louis, Mo.	40.8	11.0	54.1	9.7
New York, N. Y.	14.8	4.5	52.3	14.1	Kansas City, Mo.	29.3	10.5	33.7	9.5
Pittsburg, Pa.	23.6	8.3	82.7	24.2	Southern cities	59.3	32.7	33.7	11.4
Cincinnati, Ohio	39.3	10.3	60.5	10.8	Norfolk, Va.	79.6	36.0	26.0	3.8
Cleveland, Ohio	24.2	7.9	63.7	17.2	Charlottesville, N. C.	71.2	33.3	28.1	5.6
Indianapolis, Ind.	33.7	12.1	44.4	12.0	Gastonia, N. C.	27.7	21.8	9.9	7.2
Evansville, Ind.	22.8	6.7	59.9	14.5	Charleston, S. C.	53.6	53.1	28.5	28.0
Chicago, Ill.	22.9	6.5	50.7	11.8	Atlanta, Ga.	61.5	34.6	49.1	16.3
Benton Harbor, Mich.	19.4	6.0	63.6	17.0	Lakeland, Fla.	44.9	21.3	51.7	17.1
Detroit, Mich.	25.2	6.9	30.8	6.8	Birmingham, Ala.	62.1	41.1	37.2	15.8
Border-state cities	47.7	15.5	51.8	10.4	Jackson, Miss.	62.4	43.4	31.5	14.5
Wilmington, Del.	42.6	12.1	50.0	9.2	Biloxi, Miss.	29.7	19.7	38.0	22.0
Washington, D. C.	73.2	23.9	59.4	6.8	Lake Charles, La.	65.4	38.3	35.9	11.8
Baltimore, Md.	43.7	17.1	54.0	14.2	New Orleans, La.	65.0	30.8	27.9	6.7
Lexington, Ky.	57.0	32.3	24.3	8.7	Houston, Tex.	39.6	22.5	28.5	11.2
Bowling Green, Ky.	25.0	21.8	9.4	7.8	Little Rock, Ark.	49.8	25.7	35.6	12.4

^{a/} Selected from a sample study of 79 cities. Includes those cities in which Negro families constituted 4 per cent or more of all families in 1930 and 5 per cent or more of families on relief in May, 1934.

Sources: Katherine D. Wood, Urban Workers on Relief, Part II, Research Monograph IV, Works Progress Administration Washington 1936, pp. 72-73; and Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, Population Vol. VI.

Appendix table 59. - Size of Families on Relief, October, 1933, and of All Families, 1930, by Residence and Color

Size of family	United States Total		Urban North a/		Urban South b/		Rural South b/	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Relief families, October 1933								
Number of families (in thousands)-----	579	2,543	201	1,173	201	235	151	484
Per cent of families consisting of								
1 person -----	14.7	12.7	16.4	13.8	14.7	12.6	11.8	6.2
2 persons -----	23.6	16.3	27.6	16.5	24.0	18.1	17.4	13.5
3-4 persons -----	33.1	34.1	33.0	35.2	36.0	36.0	29.8	33.3
5-6 persons -----	16.4	22.0	14.4	21.5	16.2	21.3	19.7	25.6
7 persons or more -----	12.2	14.9	8.6	13.0	9.1	12.0	21.3	21.4
All families, 1930								
Number of families (in thousands)-----	2,804	26,705	514	11,645	785	2,223	1,408	3,689
Per cent of families consisting of								
1 person -----	12.1	7.4	13.8	6.8	16.0	6.1	8.8	4.1
2 persons -----	26.3	23.1	32.4	24.0	29.9	23.9	22.0	17.5
3-4 persons -----	30.8	39.3	31.3	41.2	31.5	41.9	30.3	36.1
5-6 persons -----	16.4	19.8	14.1	19.4	13.9	19.6	18.8	24.3
7 persons or more -----	14.4	10.4	8.4	8.6	8.7	8.5	20.1	18.0

a/ New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, and West North Central divisions.

b/ South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central divisions.

Sources: Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Unemployment Relief Census, October, 1933, Report No. 2, Washington, 1934, pp. 26-29; and Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930, Population Vol. VI, State table 5.

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Appendix table 60. - Mean Size of Rural Relief Cases in Sample Counties in the Eastern and Western Cotton Areas, February, June, and October, 1935, by Color

Month	Eastern Cotton		Western Cotton	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
February 1935	4.5	4.7	5.1	4.2
June 1935	3.8	4.3	3.9	4.3
October 1935	4.1	4.2	3.7	4.2

Source: A. R. Mangus, Changing Aspects of Rural Relief, Research Monograph XIV, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, p. 123.

Appendix table 61. - Broken Families and Nonfamily Persons or Groups as Per Cent of all Relief Cases, October, 1933, May, 1934, and June, 1935, by Color and Residence

Color	October 1933		May 1934	June 1935	
	Urban	Rural		Rural	
				Eastern Cotton	Western Cotton
Negro	41.0	34.2	43.5	49.4	46.4
White	31.8	27.4	33.2	31.2	23.8

Sources: Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Unemployed Relief Census, October, 1933, Report No. 3, Washington, 1935, pp. 37-38; Gladys L. Palmer and Katherine D. Wood, Urban Workers on Relief, Part I, Research Monograph IV, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1936, p. 9; and A. R. Mangus, Changing Aspects of Rural Relief, Research Monograph XIV, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, p. 56.

Appendix table 62. - Average Monthly General Relief Benefit per Case in Selected States, July, 1933, 1934, 1935, and 1936

State	July 1933	July 1934	July 1935	State	July 1933	July 1934	July 1935
United States total	\$15.51	\$24.34	\$29.64	Georgia	\$5.88	\$13.19	\$16.63
New York	30.59	44.93	49.06	Florida	5.58	13.82	10.06
New Jersey	19.86	29.98	31.96	Tennessee	5.87	15.61	11.60
Pennsylvania	17.81	27.35	37.80	Alabama	5.19	12.81	17.70
Ohio	15.70	24.19	31.15	Mississippi	3.83	11.12	12.96
Illinois	20.77	28.14	29.42	Arkansas	6.44	12.33	16.35
Virginia	6.94	11.13	17.65	Louisiana	13.89	22.54	26.17
North Carolina	7.64	10.60	14.32	Oklahoma	4.38	7.35	8.79
South Carolina	5.61	10.43	12.27	Texas	6.93	11.07	13.92

Source: Anne E. Geddes, Trends in Relief Expenditures, 1910-1935, Research Monograph X, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1937, p. 102.

Appendix table 63. - Per Cent of Relief Cases Receiving Work Relief Only or in Combination with Direct Relief, February, June, and October, 1935, in Sample Counties in 9 Rural Areas and in the Eastern and Western Cotton Areas, by Color

Month	Per cent receiving work relief						
	All nine areas	Eastern Cotton			Western Cotton		
		Total	Negro	White	Total	Negro	White
February, 1935	52.1	68.8	50.1	78.7	43.3	34.9	47.0
June, 1935	60.3	64.1	49.9	71.7	65.1	48.4	70.7
October, 1935	22.9	59.3	62.2	58.5	30.0	22.6	32.2

Source: A. R. Mangus, *Changing Aspects of Rural Relief*, Research Monograph XIV, Works Progress Administration, Washington, 1938, p. 130.

Appendix table 64. - Proportion of Negroes in the Relief Population, March, 1935, and on WPA Projects, May, 1940, in Counties with Cities of 10,000 or More and in Counties with No Cities of 10,000 or More in 1930 in 12 Selected Southern States ^{a/}

State	Per cent of Negroes					
	All counties		Counties with cities of 10,000 or more		Counties with no city of 10,000 or more	
	Relief population, 1935	WPA, 1940	Relief population, 1935	WPA, 1940	Relief population, 1935	WPA, 1940
North Carolina	40.5	27.4	49.9	37.7	32.3	20.8
South Carolina	48.4	33.8	46.6	35.4	49.5	32.6
Georgia	40.0	26.8	54.1	37.1	24.9	17.3
Florida	35.1	16.7	40.7	19.2	25.4	17.0
Kentucky	9.2	7.5	22.4	16.1	5.5	4.4
Tennessee	19.6	13.2	35.9	26.0	7.5	4.9
Alabama	45.9	27.2	52.5	34.1	28.8	20.0
Mississippi	32.0	24.4	42.8	36.8	25.1	17.8
Arkansas	20.9	15.1	34.9	23.1	16.5	10.8
Louisiana	54.6	34.4	61.3	41.8	35.4	21.9
Oklahoma	13.7	10.2	20.0	14.1	10.4	6.1
Texas	27.8 ^{b/}	15.9	26.1 ^{b/}	16.9	29.8 ^{b/}	15.1

^{a/} Comparable data for Virginia not available in the 1935 Census of Workers on Relief, since data for cities were kept separate from those by counties.

^{b/} In Texas only 29 counties with cities of 10,000 or more and 88 counties with no city of 10,000 or more were used rather than the state as a whole. The selected counties are in the eastern part of the state and contain the bulk of the Negroes in Texas.

Sources: Philip M. Hauser, *Workers on Relief in the United States in March, 1935* Vol. I, Part III, Works Progress Administration, Washington, D. C., 1938; and unpublished tabulations, Federal Security Agency, Works Projects Administration, Division of Statistics, June 27, 1941.

Appendix table 65 - Per Cent Distribution of Monthly Payments Initially Approved for Negro Recipients of Old-age Assistance Accepted during the Fiscal Year 1939-40 in States Accepting 100 Negro Recipients or More

State	Total		Less than \$5.00	\$5.00- \$9.99	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	\$50.00- \$54.99	\$55.00 or more
	Number	Per cent												
Pennsylvania	3,441	100.0	0.6	2.0	2.9	11.8	25.4	34.0	23.3	-	-	-	-	-
Indiana	561	100.0	0.5	3.4	19.6	30.7	27.8	10.3	7.7	-	-	-	-	-
New York	1,049	100.0	-	2.8	9.0	17.3	20.9	17.2	21.6	8.5	2.7	-	-	-
Missouri	2,062	100.0	-	6.0	25.5	29.9	20.4	8.7	9.5	-	-	-	-	-
Ohio	1,515	100.0	-	1.0	3.4	16.0	37.8	30.6	11.2	-	-	-	-	-
Illinois	1,569	100.0	-	1.9	9.1	20.0	30.0	29.7	9.3	-	-	-	-	-
California	572	100.0	-	1.2	1.6	2.6	2.4	6.2	6.6	40.8	36.6	-	-	-
Kansas	375	100.0	0.3	8.5	31.7	28.2	16.3	10.1	3.5	0.8	0.3	-	-	-
West Virginia	187	100.0	0.5	22.5	47.6	20.3	5.9	1.1	2.1	-	-	-	-	-
Massachusetts	256	100.0	-	0.8	3.5	10.5	14.5	19.5	46.9	3.9	-	-	0.4	-
Arkansas, a/	1,463	100.0	-	33.8	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kentucky	1,064	100.0	-	73.2	26.1	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	5,053	100.0	3.3	58.4	31.7	5.3	1.0	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oklahoma	862	100.0	1.6	6.7	37.6	24.7	15.6	13.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virginia	2,523	100.0	-	62.1	28.1	7.1	2.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	1,030	100.0	2.3	16.1	34.3	18.8	17.8	3.1	7.6	-	-	-	-	-
North Carolina	2,252	100.0	-	63.2	30.3	4.9	1.3	0.2	0.1	-	-	-	-	-
Georgia	549	100.0	23.7	72.8	3.3	0.2	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-
New Jersey	720	100.0	-	2.4	20.4	38.9	29.2	8.5	0.5	-	-	-	-	-
Delaware	113	100.0	-	41.6	38.1	15.9	4.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Carolina	1,057	100.0	9.6	67.4	19.6	2.4	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Texas	2,089	100.0	3.5	31.2	43.4	18.6	3.0	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
District of Columbia	262	100.0	-	0.8	13.7	11.1	16.0	40.8	17.6	-	-	-	-	-
Louisiana	3,017	100.0	1.0	48.7	33.1	11.5	3.4	1.5	0.7	-	-	0.1	-	-
Florida	1,044	100.0	-	55.0	42.0	2.9	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alabama, b/	2,433	100.0	0.8	17.3	34.3	18.1	11.5	5.3	6.9	1.8	1.9	0.6	0.5	1.0
Mississippi	1,904	100.0	1.5	86.5	10.7	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

* Less than 0.05 per cent.

a/ Preliminary data pending correction of report.

b/ Alabama reported the amount approved. In most instances this was more than the amount paid.

Source: Data furnished by the Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, Bureau of Public Assistance, Washington, July 15, 1941.

Appendix table 66. - Per Cent Distribution of Monthly Payments Initially Approved for White Recipients of Old-age Assistance Accepted during the Fiscal Year 1939-40 in States Accepting 100 Negro Recipients or More

State	Total		Less than \$5.00	\$5.00	\$10.00	\$15.00	\$20.00	\$25.00	\$30.00	\$35.00	\$40.00	\$45.00	\$50.00	\$55.00 or more
	Number	Per cent												
Pennsylvania	35,803	100.0	0.9	3.5	7.6	26.3	28.4	21.5	11.8	-	-	-	-	-
Indiana	9,860	100.0	0.5	6.3	28.7	31.4	21.3	8.2	3.6	-	-	-	-	-
New York	21,881	100.0	0.1	2.6	14.2	20.3	22.5	18.8	11.5	7.1	2.6	0.3	-	-
Missouri	26,778	100.0	0.1	7.6	31.7	31.1	17.8	6.2	5.5	-	-	-	-	-
Ohio	18,941	100.0	0.1	1.2	4.2	27.4	30.4	25.2	11.2	-	-	-	-	-
Illinois	17,570	100.0	-	2.8	12.5	25.4	25.0	22.9	11.6	-	-	-	-	-
California	24,217	100.0	0.1	1.0	1.7	2.8	5.0	7.8	9.4	37.0	35.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Kansas	5,554	100.0	0.3	10.9	28.1	20.6	17.7	8.8	4.7	1.0	0.6	0.1	-	-
West Virginia	2,786	100.0	0.2	21.5	48.5	27.1	6.2	2.0	1.5	-	-	-	-	-
Massachusetts	14,569	100.0	*	0.5	3.0	7.1	17.1	19.4	47.9	3.6	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.3
Arkansas	4,909	100.0	-	88.3	11.4	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kentucky	6,735	100.0	-	65.9	31.8	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	14,952	100.0	1.7	53.7	35.6	6.7	1.5	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oklahoma	8,626	100.0	0.9	6.9	34.8	24.0	14.5	18.8	0.1	-	-	-	-	-
Virginia	3,792	100.0	-	52.3	35.0	9.9	5.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	2,368	100.0	1.0	12.4	28.7	24.1	20.0	5.8	8.0	-	-	-	-	-
North Carolina	4,727	100.0	-	47.0	38.8	7.6	3.2	2.7	0.7	-	-	-	-	-
Georgia	572	100.0	15.7	66.3	14.2	3.0	0.5	-	0.3	0.1	-	-	-	-
New Jersey	5,124	100.0	0.1	2.4	17.2	27.7	31.0	18.9	2.6	-	-	-	-	-
Delaware	260	100.0	-	33.8	30.4	16.9	11.2	7.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Carolina	870	100.0	4.1	49.3	29.7	11.4	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Texas	8,531	100.0	1.9	18.6	37.9	27.5	12.1	1.8	0.2	-	-	-	-	-
District of Columbia	269	100.0	-	25.6	8.2	7.1	8.5	22.3	53.9	-	0.3	0.2	-	-
Louisiana	2,791	100.0	0.3	21.3	36.6	20.0	10.5	3.8	2.1	0.6	-	-	-	-
Florida	2,096	100.0	-	21.3	51.6	17.8	7.1	1.8	0.4	-	-	-	-	-
Alabama	3,695	100.0	2.3	11.7	22.8	19.4	13.5	8.7	11.1	3.1	2.8	1.4	1.0	2.2
Mississippi	2,568	100.0	-	38.5	39.9	16.7	0.1	4.5	0.4	-	0.1	-	-	-

* Less than 0.05 per cent.

a/ Preliminary data pending correction of report.

b/ Alabama reported the amount approved. In most instances this was more than the amount paid.

Source: Data furnished by the Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, Bureau of Public Assistance, Washington, July 15, 1941.

Appendix table 67. - Average Number of Families and Persons Served ^{a/} through the Distribution of Surplus Commodities in Continental United States and in Southern States, Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1940

State	Number served		Per cent of total population, 1940
	Families	Persons	
United States total	2,867,949	10,302,666	7.8
Alabama	47,390	159,394	5.6
Arkansas	60,199	208,059	10.7
Delaware	3,050	10,309	3.9
Florida	57,404	230,331	12.1
Georgia	70,391	254,066	8.1
Kentucky	63,311	307,932	10.8
Louisiana	83,484	263,038	11.1
Maryland	16,170	54,337	3.0
Mississippi	111,870	409,057	18.7
North Carolina	39,485	183,742	5.1
Oklahoma	84,985	327,526	14.0
South Carolina	38,721	109,591	5.8
Tennessee	55,305	192,983	6.6
Texas	102,443	363,451	5.7
Virginia	21,596	80,498	3.0
West Virginia	43,182	157,165	8.3
District of Columbia	8,659	33,085	5.0

a/ Exclusive of recipients in school-lunch programs, institutions and organizations, camps, and other special projects.

Sources: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the Fiscal Year 1940, Washington, 1940, p. 8; and Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Preliminary releases, Series P-2, December 4, 1940.

Appendix table 68. - Peak Number of Schools and Children Served in School-lunch Programs in Continental United States and in Southern States, 1939-40, as Per Cent of All Public Schools and Total Public-school Enrollment, 1935-36

State	Schools served	Per cent of all public schools, 1935-36 a/	Children served	Per cent of all pupils enrolled in public schools 1935-36 a/
United States total	42,783	16.6	2,992,318	11.3
Alabama	665	11.8	41,042	6.1
Arkansas	411	7.6	38,438	8.3
Delaware	85	30.9	2,282	5.0
Florida	492	17.7	52,518	13.6
Georgia	2,843	41.2	279,395	37.3
Kentucky	88	1.0	3,867	0.6
Louisiana	883	25.8	68,258	14.7
Maryland	159	9.7	6,644	2.2
Mississippi	702	10.9	47,125	7.8
North Carolina	2,104	37.8	145,289	16.3
Oklahoma	3,116	47.1	278,321	42.3
South Carolina	1,243	33.4	127,870	26.8
Tennessee	2,233	31.1	100,065	15.3
Texas	1,842	13.4	135,444	9.9
Virginia	1,046	19.4	43,940	7.4
West Virginia	914	14.5	46,001	10.2

a/ Elementary and secondary.

Sources: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the Fiscal Year 1940, Washington, 1940, p. 8; and Biennial Survey of Education, 1934-1936, Vol. II, Chap. I, p. 2, and Chap. II, p. 58

Appendix table 69. - Size of Farm during the Crop Year prior to Application for a Loan of a Sample of Farm Security Administration Standard Loan Clients Receiving Their First Standard Loans between March 1, 1936, and February 28, 1939, by Region and Color ^{a/}

Size of farm	Region IV		Region V		Region VI		Region VII	
	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White
Total: Number-----	568	4,485	948	2,212	1,006	2,697	725	4,151
Per cent.-----	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
None-----	4.8	4.5	5.9	12.1	8.0	21.3	14.3	24.0
Less than 20 acres-----	7.9	4.8	11.8	6.6	17.6	7.7	6.9	3.3
20-49 acres-----	34.1	22.4	42.2	35.1	46.1	37.7	33.7	12.6
50-99 acres-----	29.6	34.6	25.2	26.7	20.2	20.8	27.9	23.6
100-174 acres-----	15.1	23.4	9.9	13.5	5.8	9.3	13.0	22.9
175-259 acres-----	4.8	7.0	3.3	3.3	1.6	2.2	2.8	6.9
260-499 acres-----	2.6	2.6	0.5	2.3	0.6	0.8	1.4	5.1
500-999 acres-----	1.1	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.2	-	1.3
1,000 acres or more-----	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	0.3

^{a/} Exclusive of clients with tenure or color unknown.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Washington. Unpublished data from Study of Farm Security Administration Standard Loan Rural Rehabilitation Borrowers.

Appendix table 70. - Colored Farm Families as Per Cent of All Farm Families Accepted as Standard Rural Rehabilitation Borrowers in 4 Southern Regions of the Farm Security Administration, 1935-1939

Region and state	All years	Colored farm families as per cent of all borrowers				
		1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
Four southern regions - - - - -	23	23	25	20	21	23
Region IV - - - - -	14	17	16	13	11	13
Kentucky - - - - -	3	4	3	4	3	1
North Carolina - - - - -	29	43	32	26	25	24
Tennessee - - - - -	7	6	10	4	6	7
Virginia - - - - -	25	34	27	22	18	19
West Virginia - - - - -	1	1	1	1	1	1
Region V - - - - -	32	29	38	31	31	32
Alabama - - - - -	37	40	42	38	33	34
Florida - - - - -	17	18	23	13	11	13
Georgia - - - - -	24	19	27	25	22	29
South Carolina - - - - -	50	43	51	48	56	55
Region VI - - - - -	27	19	34	27	26	28
Arkansas - - - - -	14	11	14	10	14	16
Louisiana - - - - -	39	36	48	39	29	35
Mississippi - - - - -	31	23	30	37	37	35
Region VIII - - - - -	14	16	21	12	12	6
Oklahoma - - - - -	7	10	8	5	8	2
Texas - - - - -	20	22	27	21	16	9

Source: Farm Security Administration, Rural Rehabilitation Division, Planning and Control Section, Washington.

Appendix table 71. - Tenure Status during the Crop Year prior to Application for a Loan^{a/} of a Sample of Farm Security Administration Standard Loan Clients Receiving Their First Standard Loans between March 1, 1936, and February 28, 1939, by Region and Color ^{b/}

Tenure	Region IV		Region V		Region VI		Region VIII	
	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White
Total: Number-----	663	4,869	1,721	3,649	1,241	3,358	804	4,517
Per cent-----	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Full owner-----	29.1	41.3	19.0	31.1	20.8	24.6	22.4	13.8
Part owner-----	13.0	10.9	4.2	3.0	2.0	2.1	5.2	4.0
Tenant-----	41.6	34.1	55.0	40.1	46.8	32.0	47.9	51.3
Cropper-----	11.0	8.1	17.7	18.0	23.7	23.2	11.9	9.2
Hired farm laborer and unpaid farm laborer-----	3.6	2.7	2.1	2.8	2.1	6.1	2.5	8.5
Nonfarm-----	1.7	2.9	2.0	5.0	4.6	12.0	10.1	13.2

a/ Not necessarily the tenure status at time of application for the first loan.

b/ Exclusive of clients with tenure or color unknown.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Washington. Unpublished data from Study of Farm Security Administration Standard Loan Rural Rehabilitation Borrowers.

Appendix table 72. - Negro Families on Resettlement Projects, June, 1940

State	Project	Number of	Proposed
		families on project	number
	Total	1,393	1,761
Alabama	Coffee Farms	20	31
	Alabama F. T. S. a/	33	33
	Prairie Farms b/	34	34
	Gee's Bend b/	91	100
Arkansas	Lake View b/	91	35
	Central Arkansas Valley Farms	3	3
	Crowley Ridge Farms	20	23
	Arkansas Farm Tenant Security	39	42
	Arkansas Delta Farms	11	56
	Hammond Ranch Plantation	75	75
Florida	Florida Scattered Farms	21	22
Georgia	Piedmont Homesteads	7	7
	Georgia F. T. S. a/	15	25
	Flint River b/	102	107
Kentucky	Christian Trigg	0	15
Louisiana	Louisiana F. T. S. a/	24	35
	Louisiana Delta Farms b/	76	155
Mississippi	Northeast Mississippi Farms	24	35
	Mississippi Delta Farms	23	75
Missouri	Southeast Missouri	49	49
North Carolina	Roanoke	143	149
	North Carolina Farm Tenant Security	25	24
	Scuppernon	14	20
	Wolf Pit	11	11
South Carolina	Orangeburg Farms	43	68
	South Carolina Farm Tenant Security	18	25
	Allendale b/	116	120
	Tiverton	25	37
Tennessee	Tennessee F. T. S. a/	24	37
Texas	Texas F. T. S. a/	15	15
	Sabine Farms b/	79	80
Virginia	Aberdeen Gardens b/	122	158

a/ Old farm-tenant security scattered farm projects.

b/ All Negro project

Source: Farm Security Administration, Resettlement Division, Washington, June 12, 1940.

THE NEGRO'S SHARE

Appendix table 73. - Negro Participants in Land Rental Co-operative Associations, June, 1940

State and association	Number of participants
Total - - - - -	548
<u>Arkansas</u>	
Chicot Homestead Association, Inc. - - - - -	75
Ashley Homestead Association, Inc. - - - - -	10
Poinsett Homestead Association, Inc. - - - - -	36
Jefferson Co. Homestead Association, Inc. - - - - -	6
Moro Farmstead Association, Inc. - - - - -	17
Clarksdale Homestead Association, Inc. - - - - -	109
Peach Orchard Bluff Homestead Association, Inc. - - - - -	9
Hatchitochez - - - - -	26
Torres - - - - -	55
<u>Louisiana</u>	
Talla Bena Homestead Association, Inc. - - - - -	74
Minorca Farmstead Association, Inc. - - - - -	16
<u>Mississippi</u>	
Mileston Plantation - - - - -	115

Source: Farm Security Administration, Resettlement Division, Washington.

INDEX

-
- Adams County, Miss., relief, 291 n.
 Administrators, Negro, WPA, 252 f.
 AAA system, 4 n., 12, 16, 19 n., 69 n., 76
 Agricultural Marketing Administration, 290 n.
 Agriculture, Negro workers in, 10 ff., 213, 214, 215, 272 n.; labor force in, 34, 46, 57; wage-hand income, 67 ff.; changing structure of southern, 213. *See also* farm population, farms, employment, income, Farm Security Administration, etc.
 Alabama, housing, 177; relief, 225 n., 227, 259 n., 263; social security, 278, 281 n., 282
 Alaska, social security, 271
 Albany, Ga., housing, 186 n.
 Alexander Hamilton Institute, cited, 41 n.
 American Foundation for the Blind, 278
 American Guide Series, WPA, 252
 Amusement, in consumption pattern, 73
 Arkansas, Negro nonagricultural workers, 22; relief, 227, 263, 291; social security, 276, 284; FSA, 305
 Arkansas River valley, farm-family income, 69
 Army, Negro reserve officers as CCC personnel, 260
 Asheville, N. C., housing, 206
 Assets, family, defined, 91. *See also* expenditures.
 Assistance, types of public, 213 ff., 218; federal, in kind, 290 ff. *See also* CCC, NYA, WPA, etc.
 Atkins, James A., cited, 252 n.
 Atlanta, Ga., incomes, 71, 72 n., 79, 82; budget expense, 86 n., 87, 127; family expenditures, 90, 94 n., 95, 99, 100, 132 f., 136, 137 n., 139, 142, 149 ff., 156, 159, 161, 163; foodstuffs consumed, 110; automobile ownership, 144; housing, 196, 206; relief, 228 f., 236, 243 n., social security, 284
 Automobile factories, Negroes in, 25
 Automobiles, ownership of, in expenditure pattern, 89 n., 144 ff.; taxes on, 161 n.
 Baird, Enid, cited, 236 n.
 Bakeries, Negroes in, 27
 Baltimore, housing, 203, 206; relief, 228 f., 243, 286 n.
 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, 305
 Banking, Negroes in, 27
 Baton Rouge, La., housing, 206
 Beck, P. G., cited, 226 tab. n.
 Belle Glade, Fla., migratory labor camp, 308
 Benton Harbor, Mich., relief rates, 228 n.
 Bertrandville, La., housing, 182
 Birmingham, Ala., family incomes, 72 n.; food consumption, 117 n.; automobile ownership, 147 n.; housing, 187, 196, 203, 206; WPA, 243
 Blast furnaces, Negroes in, 25
 Blind, assistance for, 218, 271, 277 ff., 286, 291 n.
 Boeger, E. A., cited, 17 n.
 Bombings, anti-Negro, 209
 Boston, budget expense, 87; housing, 194
 Bowling Green, Ky., relief rates, 228
 Bradbury, Samuel, cited, 153 n.
 Brannen, C. O., cited, 17 n.
 Brazos County, Tex., school children's food, 113
 Brinton, Hugh P., cited, 236 n.
 Britten, Rollo H., cited, 277 n.
 Brokerage, Negroes in, 27
 Brown, Edgar G., cited, 255 n., 269 n.
 Brown, Josephine Chapin, cited, 292 n.
 Brown, Philip, cited, 296 n.
 Budgets, minimum, income evaluation in, 83 ff., 126 ff. *See also* expenditures, food, foodstuffs, diets, household operation, etc.
 Building industry, Negroes in, 24 f.

- Bureau of Home Economics, U. S. Agriculture Dept., cited, 86, 121, 166 n., 167
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, 73 n., 130 n. *See also* U. S. Department of Labor.
- Burns, Arthur E., cited, 225 n., 248 n.
- Carmichael, F. L., cited, 228 n., 231 n., 236 n., 237 tab. n.
- Carnegie Negro Study, cited, 201 n.
- Census, U. S. Bureau of the, cited, 10-28 *passim*, 29-46 *passim*, 47-58 *passim*, 195 n.. *See also* FERA, WPA, CCC, etc., *refs. passim*.
- Census of Agriculture, 1935, cited, 167
- Chaplains, Negro, in CCC, 261
- Charleston, S. C., housing, 187, 203, 204, 205 f.; relief rates, 228
- Charlotte, N. C., relief, 228, 243 n.
- Chattanooga, Tenn., WPA, 243
- Chicago, unemployment, 41; family income, 71 f., 72 n.; budget expense, 87; housing, 202, 207 n., 208, 310; relief, 228 n., 286 n.
- Child welfare, 216, 218. *See also* dependent children.
- Cigar factories. *See* tobacco factories.
- Cincinnati, Ohio, unemployment in, 43 n. f.; relief rates, 228 n.
- Circuit Court of Appeals, U. S., decisions, 6 n., 207
- Civil Works Administration, 185, 219
- CCC, 43 n., 245, 254 ff., 262, 269
- Clay industry, Negroes in, 25
- Clerical occupations, Negroes in, 23, 27 f.; WPA, 253
- Clerks, expenditures of, 102, 117 n., *See also* clerical occupations.
- Cleveland, Ohio, family incomes, 72 n.; housing, 187; relief rates, 228 n.
- Clothing, in consumption pattern, 59, 73; in minimum budget, 86, 87; expenditures for, 90, 99, 101, 137 ff. *See also* personal care, surplus commodities.
- Clothing industries, Negroes in, 25
- Coahoma County, Miss., relief, 291 n.
- Coal mines, Negroes in, 25
- Colleges, Negro, in U. S., 265 n. *See also* NYA.
- Colorado, NYA, 261 n.
- Columbia, S. C., family incomes, 71, 72, 82; budget expense, 86 n., 87, 127; family expenditures, 90, 132 f., 139, 152, 161; foodstuffs consumed, 110; automobile ownership, 147 n.
- Columbus, Ohio, family incomes, 71 f., 72 n., 82; budget expense, 87, 127; family expenditures, 90, 136, 152, 159, 163; automobile ownership, 144
- Compensation, workmen's. *See* unemployment.
- Concordia Parish, La., cotton-picker income, 70
- Connecticut, social security, 271 n.
- Construction industries, Negroes in, 25
- Consumer Purchases Study, cited, 48 n., 59 ff., 67 n., 70 f., 72 n., 73 n., 74, 77, 79 ff., 85, 87, 90 f., 93 f., 94 n., 102, 114, 117, 123, 130 n., 136, 142, 144 n., 147 n., 157, 161, 167, 172, 174, 179, 181, 185 ff., 189, 219, 223, 231 n.
- Consumer Use of Selected Goods and Services, 185, 187, 189
- Consumption, family as unit of, 47, 58, 59, 74 ff.; pattern of, 59, 73, 89; food, 102 ff., 105 ff., 110 ff., 114 ff., 117 ff. *See also* income, family, budgets, expenditures.
- Contributions, expenditures for, 161 ff.
- Coons, Callie Mae, cited, 103 n.
- Co-operatives, FSA loans for, 297, 307, 308; housing, 310
- Cotton, production of, 15 f., 19 n., 113; WPA survey of plantations, cited, 60, 67 ff.; income from, 67, 70, 77; expenditures of families growing, 90; Alabama producers of, under FERA, 225 n. f.; areas, relief in, 227, 231, 233, 234
- Cotton Stamp Plan, 290 f., 293
- Crisis, *The*, cited, 260
- Dabney, Virginius, cited, 215 n.
- Dallas, Tex., housing, 187, 206, 243 n.
- Davis, Allison, cited, 18 n.
- Dedrick, Calvert L., cited, 40 tab. n., 246 tab. n.
- Deficiencies, dietary. *See* diets.
- Delaware, social security, 271 n.
- Delinquency, juvenile, 216
- Dental care. *See* medical care.
- Dependent children, aid to, 271, 279, 280 ff., 286
- Depression. *See* industrial depression.
- Detroit, unemployment, 40, 41; budget expense, 87
- Diets, nutritional-analysis data, 102 n., 117; home-produced food in, 102 f.; deficiency, 114 ff.; nutritive content of, 117 ff. *See also* food, foodstuffs, etc.
- Disabled, as nonworkers, 38. *See also* medical care.

- District of Columbia, court decisions, 207 f.; relief, 227 n., 241, 252, 261 n., 263; social security, 271, 276, 278, 281 n.
- Doctors, Negro, in CCC, 261
- Domestic service, Negroes in, 23, 214, 215, 245 f., 267 n., 272 n. *See also* servants.
- Dorn, Harold F., cited, 54 n., 216 n.
- Drivers, Negro, WPA, 253
- Dunklin County, Mo., farm-family income, 68 f.
- Earners, gainful workers v., 55, 57; in family consumption pattern, 73; expenditures of wage, 102, 117 n. *See also* income sources.
- Education, as employment factor, 44 f., 213; expenditures for, 159 ff.; WPA program, 250; Negroes as advisers in CCC, 260; FSA program, 297. *See also* NYA.
- Edwards, Alba M., cited, 27, 28 tab. n.
- Electrical machinery and supplies factories, Negroes in, 27
- Elevator operators, Negro, WPA, 253
- Employment, Negro nonagricultural, 21 ff.; trends, 29 ff., 45 f., 308 f.; relief turnover to, 228 f., 236. *See also* agriculture, workers, unemployment, income.
- Ensminger, Douglas, cited, 69 n.
- Equipment, household. *See* household operation.
- Evansville, Ind., relief rates, 228 n.
- Expenditures, family, factors in, 89, 91, 93; data, 90; balance of income and, 91 ff.; distribution of, 94 ff. *See also* food, foodstuffs, housing, household operation, clothing, etc.
- Family, as production unit, 47, 73 ff., 77; as consumption unit, 47, 58, 59, 74 ff.; income v. size and age composition, 47, 48 ff., 57 f., 80 ff.; definition, 48 n., 231 n.; types, 50 ff., 80 n., 94 f. n., 105 ff., 179; workers, 55 ff., 73, 80 ff.; normal, defined, 62 n. *See also* relief families, income, budgets, clothing, housing, expenditures, food, household operation, etc.
- Farm-Housing Survey, cited, 166 f., 167 ff., 172 ff., 176 ff.
- Farm operator, income, 67 ff., 81; defined, 67 n.; income sources, 73 ff.; family expenditures, 90, 95, 142, 149, 151, 152, 154 ff.; foodstuffs consumed, 113, 114. *See also* income, expenditures, food, rural-farm housing, Farm Security Administration, etc.
- Farm population, causes of decrease in Negro, 12 ff.; disabled in, 38; unemployment-data technique, 43 n.; family size, 48, 51, 82 n.; as automobile owners, 147, 149; housing, 166 ff. *See also* agriculture, income, expenditures, food, household operation, clothing, Farm Security Administration, etc.
- Farm Security Administration, 214, 218, 287 n., 295 ff.; standard loan program, 298 ff.; grant program, 304 f.; tenant-purchase program, 305 ff.; rehabilitation project program, 307 ff.
- Farm Tenancy*, cited, 16 n.
- Farms, value of Negro owner-operated, 14 f.; business expense, 67 n., 68 n.; owners' income from, 69. *See also* agriculture, income, income sources, rural-farm housing, Farm Security Administration, etc.
- Farnham, Rebecca, cited, 221 n., 236 n.
- FERA, 86 n., 185, 218, 239, 241, 246, 286, 287, 290, 295, 296, 307 n.; relief-incidence survey, 219 ff.; family composition under, 230 ff.; size of grants under, 233 ff.
- Federal government, Negro post-office employees, 26. *See also* relief.
- Federal Home Loan Banks, 312
- Federal Housing Administration, 185, 312 ff.
- Federal Security Agency, 271 n.
- Federal Surplus Marketing Administration, 290
- Fertilizer factories, Negroes in, 25
- Financial Survey of Urban Housing of 1934, cited, 59, 72, 86, 144 f. n., 185
- Florant, Lyonel C., cited, 54 n., 216 n.
- Florida, housing, 170; relief, 259 n., 263, 291; social security, 277, 284; FSA, 302, 308
- Folsom, Josiah C., cited, 69 n., 70 n.
- Food, in consumption pattern, 59, 73; in minimum budget, 83, 86, 126 ff.; expenditures for, 90, 95 ff., 99 ff., 103 n., 105 ff., 120 ff.; consumption of, 102 ff., 105 ff., 110 ff., 114 ff., 117 ff. *See also* foodstuffs, surplus commodities, etc.
- Food Stamp Plan, 290, 292 f.
- Foodstuffs, various, expenditures for, 105 ff., 120 ff.; quantities of, consumed, 110 ff.; proportions of families consuming, 114 ff.; nutritive con-

- tent of, consumed, 117 ff. *See also* food, diets, etc.
- Ford, James, cited, 310 n.
- Forster, M. C., cited, 226 tab. n.
- Fortune Magazine*, cited, 201 n.
- Fourteenth Amendment, 207
- Fuel, in consumption pattern, 67 n.
- Fulton County, Ga., social security, 284; general relief, 290
- Furnishings, household. *See* household operation, surplus commodities.
- Furniture factories, Negroes in, 27
- Gainful workers, definition, 29; earners v., 55, 57; in family-income pattern, 82 f.
- Garages, Negroes in, 25
- Gardner, Burleigh B., cited, 18 n.
- Gardner, Mary R., cited, 18 n.
- Gas wells, Negro workers in, 26
- Gastonia, N. C., housing, 186 n.; relief rates, 228
- Georgia, family income, 62, 68, 74 ff., 77 ff.; family expenditures, 90, 95, 142, 149, 151 n., 152, 154 ff.; housing, 167, 172, 179; juvenile delinquency, 216 n.; relief, 221, 223, 227, 256, 258, 259 n., 261 n., 263, 269, 290, 293, 294; social security, 273, 276, 278, 281 n., 282, 284
- Gifts, expenditures for, 99, 101, 161 ff.
- Glass industry, Negroes in, 25
- Gold, Norman Leon, cited, 292 n., 293 n.
- Goldenweiser, E. A., cited, 17 n.
- Goldwasser, Betti C., 215 n.
- Grant program, FSA, 304 ff.
- Greene County, Ga., wage-hand income, 68; sources of farm-family income, 74 n.; CCC, 256, 258
- Greenville, S. C., housing, 206
- Gregory, Cecil L., cited, 69 n.
- Griffin, Ga., housing, 186 n.
- Hansen, Morris H., cited, 40 tab. n., 246 tab. n.
- Harvey, Oswald L., cited, 263
- Hauser, Philip M., cited, 221 n., 222 tab. n., 224 tab. n., 244 tab. n., 250 tab. n.
- Hawaii, social security, 271
- Health, insurance, 214 n.; public, programs, 215 f. *See also* disabled.
- Heckscher, Eli Filip, cited, 6 n.
- Hill, H. H., Superintendent (Lexington, Ky.), cited, 6 n.
- Hoffman, A. C., cited, 292 n., 293 n.
- Hoffsommer, Harold, cited, 225 n.
- Holley, William C., cited, 19 n.
- HOLC, 312
- Horowitz, Eugene L., cited, 201 n.
- Hospitals, Negro segregation in, 202
- Household operation, in minimum budget, 86; durable equipment for, 89 n., 133 ff., 157 ff., 176; expenditures for, 90 f., 99, 101, 130 ff.
- Housewives, as nonworkers, 35, 36, 130
- Home ownership, in expenditure pattern, 89 n., 161 n.; urban, 195 f.; effect of depression on, 311; federal help toward, 312 ff. *See also* Farm Security Administration.
- Homestead projects, FSA, 307 f.
- Housing, in consumption pattern, 59, 67 n.; in minimum budget, 83, 85, 86 f.; expenditures for, 99, 101; policies, 310 ff.; agencies, 312 ff.; subsidized, 316 ff. *See also* rural-farm housing, rural-nonfarm housing, urban housing.
- Houston, Tex., housing, 194; relief, 228 f., 236
- Hoyt, Homer, cited, 204 ff.
- Illinois, social security, 271 n.
- Illness, frequency rate of. *See* medical care.
- Income, family, 47, 48 ff., 57 f., 80 ff.; data, 59 f.; distribution, 60 ff.; race-differential analysis, 60 f.; from relief, 61 f., 219 ff., 230 ff., 300, 302; farm, 62 ff., 81; farm net, defined, 69; southern village, 70 f., 81 f.; urban, 71 ff., 82; effect of, on Negro housing, 201. *See also* income sources, family, consumption, budgets, food-stuffs, etc.
- Income sources, family, 73 ff., 77 ff. *See also* income, budgets, FERA, etc.
- Industrial depression, Negro farm population during, 11 f., 213; retirement as result of, 31, 33, 39; automobile ownership during, 147; effect of, on housing, 201, 310 f. *See also* relief, housing, FERA, etc.
- Industry, Negroes in, 21 ff.
- Institutions, inmates of, as nonworkers, 38 f.; Negro segregation in, 202; care of children in, 216
- Insurance, Negroes in, 27; health and accident, 152 f.; life, companies in home financing, 195 f.; survivors', 214 f., 218; social, creation of, 218. *See also* Social Security Act.

- Iowa, social security, 271 n.
 Iron industries, Negroes in, 25
- Jackson, Miss., housing, 187; CCC, 260 n.
 Jacksonville, Fla., WPA, 243 n.
 Jefferson County, Tex., school children's food, 113
 Johnson, Charles S., cited, 166 n., 206 n., 258
 Johnson, Palmer O., cited, 263
 Jones, Lewis W., cited, 153 n.
 Jones, William Henry, cited, 203 f.
- Karpinos, Bernard D., cited, 37 tab. n., 44 tab. n.
 Kentucky, Negro nonagricultural workers, 22; farm-laborer income, 69 f.; relief, 227 n., 261 n., 263, 291; social security, 271 n.; FSA, 301
 Kirk, Dudley, cited, 54 n., 216 n.
 Klineberg, Otto, cited, 5 n., 201 n.
 Knight, Charles Louis, cited, 203 n.
 Knoxville, Tenn., WPA, 243
 Kurtz, Russell H., cited, 215 n.
- Labor force, definition, 29
 Landlords, cotton plantation, WPA survey, cited, 60, 67 ff.; under FERA, 225 n., f., 233; under FSA, 297. *See also* Farm Security Administration.
 Lasher, John H., NYA Director, cited, 267 n.
 Laundresses, Negro home, 24
 Laundries, commercial, Negroes in, 24
 Laundry. *See* household operation.
 League of Nations reports, *Relation of Nutrition to Health*, cited, 9 n.
 Lee, Roger I., cited, 153 n.
 Leisure-time activities. *See* recreation.
 Leonard, O. E., cited, 69 n.
 Lexington, Ky., teacher-salary study, quoted, 6 f.
 Liabilities, family, defined, 91. *See also* expenditures.
 Link, Irene, cited, 221 n., 236 n.
 Loan program, standard, FSA, 298 ff.
 Lodgers, influence on households, 48 n., 49 n., 54 f., 58, 179, 197, 231
 Loomis, C. P., cited, 69 n.
 Los Angeles, housing, 194
 Louisiana, cotton-picker income, 70; housing, 176, 182; relief, 227, 241, 243, 259 n., 290 n., 291, 294; social security, 278, 280, 281 n.; FSA, 301
 Louisville, Ky., housing, 206, 207; WPA, 243 n.
- McEntee, James J., CCC Director, cited, 258 n.
 McNutt, Paul V., cited, 258 n.
 Macon County, Ga., wage-hand income, 68; sources of farm-family income, 74 n.; CCC, 256, 258
 Managerial positions, Negroes in, 27 f.
 Mangus, A. R., cited, 226 tab. n., 232 n., 233 n., 235 tab. n.
 Manufacturing, Negroes in, 22 f.
 Maryland, housing, 176; relief, 227 n., 241, 243; social security, 278; FSA, 301
 Mechanical industries, Negroes in, 22 f.
 Medical care, expenditures for, 99, 101, 149 ff.; programs, 215 f., 297 n. *See also* Farm Security Administration.
 Melvin, Bruce L., cited, 260 n.
 Memphis, Tenn., food consumption, 117 n.; WPA, 243
 Miami, Fla., WPA, 243; housing, 321
 Migratory labor camps, 308
 Miscellaneous items, in minimum budget, 86; expenditures for, 99, 101
 Mississippi, family incomes, 62, 74 ff., 77 ff.; family expenditures, 90, 95, 142, 149, 151 n., 152, 154 ff.; housing, 167, 172, 176, 179; relief, 215, 221, 223, 227, 259 n., 263, 264, 291; social security, 271 n., 276, 277, 278, 280, 281 n.
 Missouri, farm-family income, 68 f.; relief, 227 n., 241, 263; social security, 271 n.; FSA, 301
 Mob violence, anti-Negro, 209
 Mobile, Ala., family incomes, 71, 72, 82; budget expense, 86 n., 87, 127; family expenditures, 90, 132 f., 139, 152, 161; foodstuffs consumed, 110, 117 n.
 Model tenements, U. S., 310 n.
 Monchow, Helen C., cited, 208 n.
 Money value, definition, 94 n.
Monthly Labor Review, cited, 43 tab. n.
 Myrdal, Alva, cited, 8 n., 214 n.
 Myrdal, Gunnar, cited, 8 n.
- Nashville, Tenn., WPA, 243
 Nassimbene, R., cited, 228 n., 236 n., 237 tab. n.
 Nathan, Robert, cited, 41 n.
 NAACP, cited, 207 n.
 National Health Survey of 1935-36, cited, 34, 37, 40, 44, 48 n., 59, 72, 85, 87, 150 n., 185, 187, 194, 219, 223, 277, 278, 279

- National Research Council, Food and Nutrition Committee, 120 n.
 National Resources Committee, cited, 60, 91 n.
 NYA, 43 n., 245, 254, 261 ff., 269, 270
 Nebraska, NYA, 261 n.
Negro Year Book, cited, 207 n., 208 n.
 Nevada, social security, 271 n.
 New Deal, relief policies, 218 ff.
 New Jersey, farm-laborer income, 70
 New Madrid County, Mo., farm-family income, 68 f.
 New Orleans, La., food consumption, 117 n.; housing, 207; relief, 228, 243, 287 n., 290
 New York City, unemployment, 41; family incomes, 71 f.; budget expense, 86 n., 87; family expenditures, 90, 95, 99, 100, 142, 149, 151 f., 154 ff., 163; automobile ownership, 144; housing, 186 n., 194, 202, 310, 320; relief rates, 228 n.
New York Herald Tribune, cited, 258 n.
 New York State, relief in, 234; social security, 284
 Newark, N. J., budget expense, 87; housing, 320 f.
 Newspapers, expenditures for, 156 f.
 Nicol, Mary Aylett, cited, 86 n.
 Nonworkers, classified, 35 ff.; under FERA, 229, 232 f.
 Norfolk, Va., teacher-salary differentials, 6 n.; housing, 206; relief, 228, 243
 North Carolina, family incomes, 62, 67, 74 ff., 77 ff.; family expenditures, 90, 157, 159; housing, 167, 172, 176, 179, 186 n.; relief, 223, 227, 228, 236 n., 259 n., 263, 291, 294; social security, 273, 282; FSA, 301, 305, 308
 North Carolina Supreme Court decision, 207
 Nutrition. *See* food, foodstuffs, diets.
- Oil wells, Negro workers in, 26
 Okeechobee Migratory Labor Camp, 308 n.
 Oklahoma, cotton acreage and production, 16; relief, 227, 291, 293, 294; social security, 280; FSA, 301, 305, 307
 Oklahoma City, Okla., housing, 206, 207
 Oklahoma State Supreme Court decision, 207
 Old-age assistance, 31, 38, 214 f., 218, 271, 272 ff., 279, 280, 281 n., 286, 287, 291 n.
- Oregon, NYA, 261 n.
 Oxley, Howard W., cited, 256 tab. n.
- Packing houses, Negroes in, 25
 Paducah, Ky., housing, 187
 Palmer, Gladys L., cited, 229 n., 230 tab. n.
 Paper industries, Negroes in, 27
 Parks, Negroes' use of, 147. *See also* recreation.
 Payne, Stanley L., cited, 231 n.
 Pemiscot County, Mo., farm-family income, 68 f.
 Pennsylvania, social security, 271 n.
 Perrott, G. St. J., cited, 150 n.
 Personal care, in consumption pattern, 73; expenditures for, 99, 101, 141 ff. *See also* clothing.
 Personal service, Negroes in, 23, 214, 272 n.
 Philadelphia, unemployment, 41
 Philipard, Esther F., cited, 113 n., 117 n., 118 n., 119 tab. n., 120 n., 122 tab. n., 123 n., 126, 127 n.
 Phoenix, Ariz., housing, 206
 Planing mills, Negroes in, 24
 Plantations, Negroes on, 14 ff.; WPA survey of cotton, cited, 60, 67 ff. *See also* cotton.
 Postal service, Negroes in, 26
 Powdermaker, Hortense, cited, 4 n., 6 n.
 Printing industries, Negroes in, 27
 Processed foods, consumption of, 115
 Production, family as unit of, 47, 73 ff., 77; home food, 102 f. *See also* family income, budgets, foodstuffs, Farm Security Administration, etc.
 Professional service, Negroes in, 23, 27 f.
 Propaganda, racial, 209
 Public service, Negroes in, 26
 PWA Housing Division, 317, 318
- Race differentials. *See* FERA, employment, income, farm population, relief, relief families, expenditures, foodstuffs, household operation, clothing, housing, etc.
 Railroads, Negro workers on, 25
 Raper, Arthur F., cited, 17 n., 68 tab. n., 74 n., 147, 149, 200 n., 256, 258, 281 n.
 Reading matter. *See* recreation.
 Real estate, Negroes in, 27
 Real Property Inventories, 185, 186, 189 ff., 192 ff., 197 n., 204

- Recreation, expenditures for, 99, 101, 154 ff.; WPA supervisors of, 252
- Rehabilitation project program, FSA, 307 ff. *See also* rural rehabilitation.
- Reid, Ira De A., cited, 203 f., 261 n.
- Relief, effect on Negro farm population, 20, 165; for disabled, 38; means tests, 62 n., 219; home financing, 196; programs, 213 ff., 218 f.; policies, New Deal, 218 ff.; general, 286 ff.; federal, in kind, 290 ff. *See also* relief families, WPA, AAA, FERA, Social Security Act, CCC, etc.
- Relief families, income, 61 ff., 70 ff., 81 ff., 163, 165, 219; housing, 187, 189, 321; composition of, under FERA, 230 ff. *See also* FERA, AAA, WPA, budgets, Farm Security Administration, etc.
- Rentals, urban, 186, 196 ff., 317, 318 n., 320 f. *See also* housing, segregation.
- Renters, cash, farm income of. *See* tenure status.
- Research specialists, Negro, WPA, 252
- Resettlement Administration, 67 n., 295, 296, 307 n.
- Resorts, Negroes' use of, 147. *See also* recreation.
- Restrictive covenants, 207 ff., 315 f.
- Rhode Island, NYA, 261 n.
- Richmond, Va., family incomes, 72 n.; food consumption, 117 n.; housing, 202 f., 206, 207; WPA, 243
- Road maintenance, Negroes in, 25
- Rockefeller, John D., apartments for Negroes, 310
- Rolling mills, steel, Negroes in, 25
- Rosenwald, Julius, apartments for Negroes, 310
- Rubber factories, Negroes in, 27
- Rural Electrification Administration, 174, 176
- Rural-farm housing, data, 166 f.; structure of, 167 ff.; facilities and conveniences, 172 ff.; crowded living conditions, 176 ff.; Negro segregation, 200 n.
- Rural-nonfarm housing, 181 ff.
- Rural rehabilitation, 218, 227, 286, 295 ff., 298 ff., 307 ff.
- St. Louis, Mo., housing, 206
- San Antonio, Tex., WPA, 243
- Sawmills, Negroes in, 24
- Schmidt, Carl J., cited, 19 n.
- Schmitter, Lyle L., cited, 215 n.
- School-lunch program, 291, 292, 293 f.
- Schools, Negro segregation in, 202.
- School teachers. *See* teachers.
- Schuler, E. A., cited, 17 n.
- Seamstresses, Negro, 24, 251
- Secretaries, Negro, WPA, 253
- Segregation, racial, in urban housing, 200 ff., 314 ff.
- Self-employed, Negro, 214
- Semiskilled workers, Negro nonagricultural, 27 f.
- Servants, resident, 48 n., 49 n., 179, 207; in Negro families, 54 n., 132; expenditures for, 132. *See also* domestic service.
- Sharecroppers, conditions of plantation, 17 ff., 225; income, 62 ff., 81; family expenditures, 90, 91, 95, 99, 133 ff., 149, 151, 154 ff.; foodstuffs consumed, 113, 114. *See also* income sources, rural-farm housing, Farm Security Administration, etc.
- Shoe factories, Negroes in, 27
- Skilled workers, Negro nonagricultural, 27 f.
- Slaughter houses, Negroes in, 25
- Slum clearance, housing projects v., 322 f.
- Smith, A. E., cited, 252 n.
- Smith, Elna N., cited, 206 n.
- Social Security Act., 271 f., 272 ff., 277 ff., 280 ff. *See also* relief.
- Social-welfare programs, 213 ff., 218
- Soil conservation. *See* Farm Security Administration.
- South Carolina, sources of family incomes, 74 ff., 77 ff.; family expenditures, 90, 157, 159; housing, 167, 172, 176, 179; relief, 227, 241, 259 n., 263, 269, 294; social security, 273, 276, 278, 280, 281 n., 282, 284
- South Dakota, social security, 271 n.
- Springfield, Mo., housing, 194
- Standard loan program, FSA, 298 ff.
- Standard of living. *See* consumption, budgets.
- Stapp, Peyton, cited, 86 n., 185 n.
- Statistical Abstract of the United States*, cited, 86 n.
- Stecker, Margaret Loomis, cited, 85 ff., 139 n.
- Steel industries, Negroes in, 25
- Stephenson, Gilbert T., cited, 207 n.
- Stiebeling, Hazel K., cited, 103 n., 113, 117 n., 118 n., 119 tab. n., 120 n., 122 tab. n., 123 n., 126, 127 n.
- Stone, I. F., cited, 208 n.
- Stone industry, Negroes in, 25

- Stouffer, Samuel A., cited, 54 n., 216 n.
 Students, as nonworkers, 35, 37
 Sumter, S. C., housing, 186 n.
 Supervisors, Negro, of NYA, 262
 Supreme Court, U. S., decisions, 207, 208
 Surplus commodities, distribution of, 214, 218, 286, 290 ff.

 Tampa, Fla., WPA, 243
 Taxes, expenditures for personal, 161 ff.
 Teachers, salary differentials, 6 f.; number of Negro, 25; under WPA, 252
 Telegraph and Telephone companies, Negroes in, 27
 Telephone. *See* household operation.
 Tenant Purchase loans, 298 n.
 Tenant-purchase program, 305 ff.
 Tenants, rural, on plantations, 17 ff.; WPA survey of cotton-plantation, cited, 60; income, 67 ff.; family expenditures, 133 ff.; under FERA, 225 n., 233; under FSA, 297, 304, 305 ff.; under USHA, 318. *See also* income sources, housing, Farm Security Administration, etc.
 Tennessee, relief, 241, 259 n., 263, 264, 294; social security, 273; FSA, 301, 305
 Tenure status, and stability, farm workers', 12 ff.; and income, 68 f., 76 n.; FSA program for improving, 297, 304. *See also* housing, farm population, etc.
 Texas, cotton acreage and production, 16; school children's food consumption, 113; relief, 223, 227, 263; social security, 271 n.; FSA, 301, 302, 307.
 Textile industry, Negroes in, 26
 Theaters, Negroes' use of, 157
 Thompson, Edgar T., cited, 200 n.
 Tobacco, North Carolina income from, 67; expenditures of families growing, 90. *See also* recreation.
 Tobacco factories, Negroes in, 25
 Todd County, Ky., farm-laborer income, 69 f.
 Trade, Negroes in, 22 f., 25 f., 27
 Transients, public provisions for, 216 f.
 Transportation, Negroes in, 22 f.; in consumption pattern, 73; expenditures for, 99, 101, 144 ff.
 Travel, expenditures for, 144 ff.
 Turpentine production, Negroes in, 24

 Unemployment, trends, 39 ff.; effect of, on Negroes, 213 ff.; compensation, 215, 218, 287; effect of, on housing, 311
 Unemployment Check Census of 1937, cited, 34-35, 40 f., 44, 45, 245.
 Unemployment Relief Census, cited, 232. *See also* FERA.
 U. S. Department of Agriculture, 86, 130 n.
 U. S. Department of Commerce, housing data, 185
 U. S. Department of Labor, studies on income and disbursements, cited, 59 f., 73
 U. S. Housing Authority, 316 n., 317, 318 ff.
 Unskilled workers, Negro nonagricultural, 27 f.; former, in NYA, 267 n. *See also* FERA, WPA.
 Urban housing, data, 185 f.; quality of, 186 ff.; overcrowding in, 192 ff.; home ownership, 195 f.; rentals, 196 ff.; segregation in Negro, 200 ff., 314 ff.; agencies, 312 ff.; subsidized, 316 ff. *See also* housing, rentals, etc.

 Van Hecke, M. T., cited, 208 n.
 Vance, Rupert B., cited, 200 n.
 Vasey, Tom, cited, 69 n., 70 n.
 Virginia, Negro nonagricultural workers, 22; juvenile delinquency, 216 n.; relief, 221, 234, 243, 263, 286 n., 290 n.; social security, 273; FSA, 301, 308

 Wage hands, agricultural. *See* agriculture.
 Walker, Helen M., cited, 260 n.
 Walker, Mabel L., cited, 203 n.
 Washington, D. C., housing, 203 f., 207 f.; relief, 228, 243 n.
 Waugh, Frederick V., cited, 292 n., 293 n.
 Webb, John N., cited, 70 n., 217 n.
 West Virginia, relief, 264
 Whetten, Nathan L., cited, 231 n.
 White, Max R., cited, 69 n.
 White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, 278 n.
 Wichita, Kans., housing, 206
 Wichita Falls, Tex., housing, 206
 Wickens, David L., cited, 185 n., 199 tab. n. *See also* Financial Survey of Urban Housing.
 Williams, Edward A., cited, 225 n., 248 n.

- Winston, Ellen, cited, 19 n., 76 n.
- Winston-Salem, N. C., housing, 206, 207
- Wood, Katherine D., cited, 227 n., 229 n., 230 tab. n.
- Woodworking factories, Negroes in, 27
- Woofter, T. J., Jr., cited, 4 n., 15 n., 17 n., 18 n., 19 n., 67 n., 76 n., 77, 202 f., 204
- Work, Monroe N., cited, 207 n., 208 n.
- Work relief. *See* WPA, CCC, NYA, etc.
- Workers, socio-economic status of Negro, 27 f.; gainful, definition, 29; number of, in families, 55 ff. *See also* agriculture, employment, nonworkers, unemployment, relief.
- WPA, 20 n., 43 n., 287; survey of cotton plantations, cited, 60; quantity budgets, 85 ff., 139, 141, 147; housing improvements, 172, 174; housing data, 185; inauguration of, 227; proportion of Negroes on, 239 ff.; wage rates, 246 ff.; occupational classification, 248 ff.; type of project, 251 ff., 291. *See also* plantations.
- World War, first, effect on Negro farm population, 19 f.
- Woytinsky, W. S., cited, 215 n.
- Writers, Negro, WPA, 252
- Youth programs. *See* NYA, CCC.
- Zimmerman, Carle C., cited, 231 n.
- Zoning ordinances, 206 ff., 315 f.

